VINDICATION

OF

MR. MAURICE'S

MODERN INDIA.

A

VINDICATION

OF THE

MODERN HISTORY OF HINDOSTAN,

FROM

THE GROSS MISREPRESENTATIONS, AND ILLIBERAL STRICTURES OF THE EDINBURGH REVIEWERS,

BY THE AUTHOR.

A *learn'd* and *liberal* SCOT my soul admires,
Whose breast the spark of heav'n-born GENIUS fires;
But, *here*, with snarling churls the war I wage,
And bid defiance to their barbarous rage!!!
Impetuous fly their poison'd shafts around,
But on *my* ample shield, *innoxious*, bound.



LONDON:

PRINTED BY W. BULMER AND CO. CLEVELAND-ROW, ST. JAMES'S;

SOLD BY J. WHITE, FLEET-STREET; AND R. FAULDER, BOND-STREET.

1805.

A

VINDICATION, &c.

A WRITER or writers, in the tenth number of the Edinburgh Review, having attacked the MODERN HISTORY of HINDOSTAN with an asperity, not unusual with that Review, but which I consider as perfectly unjustifiable, in respect to a work, part of which only was before them, and that part necessarily the most abstruse and difficult,—from the remoteness of the period and the deficiency of authentic documents to guide the progress of the historian through the darkness of ages so immersed in barbarity, and so deeply stained with blood,—I consider it as an incumbent duty which I owe to the generous patrons and encouragers of that undertaking, few in number, but highly respectable in rank and literary character, to offer the following summary reply to their unmerited censures, and to make the present appeal to the candour and generosity of an impartial public.

After the unqualified abuse of my book, and of myself, who am represented as totally destitute of *taste, and skill in historical composition*, I hope to stand excused, if, without exactly following the line of illiberal invective generally adopted by the writers of the Edinburgh Review, expressions of

just indignation should occasionally burst from me, at what appears a determined attempt to rob me of every particle of well-earned fame, and what is a not less important consideration to a man printing at his sole cost and hazard, a voluminous work, upon which very considerable sums have already been expended, to blast it for ever in the public opinion, and to render a large portion of the edition yet remaining unsold, a mass of waste paper on the shelf of the bookseller.

I perfectly agree with the Reviewers that the *Modern* History of India, according to the common usage of the word modern, properly commences with the Gaznavide conquests in "Sindetic Hindostan," a term very rightly used for the region first invaded by Mahmud, but not at all applicable to his later conquests of Mathura and Canouge, which are in Gangetic India. But why thus ostentatiously announce this important intelligence, except to expose my *presumed* ignorance to that portion of the literary world who may happen to be unacquainted with the work, when in the *very first* page of the preface I had myself asserted the fact in question, and admitted in some degree the improper application of the term *modern*, in the following explicit passage. What critics but those determined at all events, for reasons that have long been sufficiently apparent, to abuse and misrepresent every more important production of the *English* press; or urged by jealous and interested motives, by the ruin of mine, to prepare the way for some miserable historical effort of their own,

on the subject of India, but would have fairly presented the passage to that public whose discerning eye must immediately see through the base artifice, and interested manœuvre!

"The Title of MODERN HISTORY OF HINDOSTAN, by which I have distinguished the present Work, must be understood by the reader *comparatively*, with respect to those very remote periods to which the preceding Volumes have reference, and to which all transactions in India, posterior to the invasion of Alexander, must undoubtedly be considered as *Modern*. Although, for the sake of *connection*, it has been thought proper to commence the Work from that conqueror's decease, yet it will be candidly confessed by every person conversant with the subject, that, deducting what the classical writers of Greece and Rome have delivered down to us concerning the Greek empire of Bactria, founded on the ruins of the Macedonian, and the intercourse with India of the Egyptian, Syrian, and Parthian empires, there exist but very scanty materials for any regular history of India, till the establishment, in Asia, of the celebrated dynasty of the Gaznavide Sultans, the rapacious conquerors, in the tenth century, of that secluded and beautiful region. Whether any native histories of these times remain among the literary treasures of Benares, and to what extent, is a point extremely uncertain; but what has been observed in a former work seems more likely to be the genuine fact, that the Brahmins have been more zealous to preserve the history of their wretched superstitions than that of

their early sovereigns. None, at least, have yet appeared in the languages of Europe, though every thing is to be expected from the industry and talents of the gentlemen who compose the Asiatic Society. What could be done by an individual, has been performed with zeal, with diligence, and with perseverance. From every quarter, whence a ray of intelligence could be obtained, I have endeavoured to collect the scattered gleams, and have brought their concentrated light to bear upon the obscure subject which I have, for some years, laboured to illumine." Preface, p. vi.

It is a task far from difficult, by means of gross mistatement and mangled quotation, by the entire suppression of important passages, and the production of those of trivial consideration, or by minutely dwelling on those little inaccuracies that will sometimes escape an author in the hurry and ardour of composition, to make any work, however otherwise useful and valuable, appear ridiculous and contemptible. It is thus that VOLNEY, and HUME, the latter a name always mentioned with profound respect in the pages of the Edinburgh Review, have so far influenced weak minds, as to make portions of the sacred Scriptures themselves appear absurd and contemptible, when a more attentive perusal and closer examination, would have impressed the mind with increased respect, and profounder veneration.

Two or three short unconnected quotations in the course of the critique, are given evidently with a view to degrade the work; but that essential

justice which results to an author from a considerable extract, where some important event is described, by which the genuine merit of an historian may be appreciated, is denied me; and though the regular history of the Greek princes of Bactria, who in fact were *sovereigns of western India*, given by me from Bayer's scarce and valuable tract, is not only new to an English reader, but forms an interesting portion of the general history of India, during a century and an half, it is scarcely mentioned in the Review. The most diligent and minute research into classical authors for historical facts, during those periods, when we absolutely are without any native accounts, is condemned and even ridiculed, as fruitless toil, and as "reducing the unfortunate ancients, so ransacked, to a state of penury," (which some readers will consider as no small compliment paid to my application and industry) while that which is acknowledged to be *impossible to be performed*, in our present ignorance of the domestic history of India, is ungenerously and arrogantly demanded of me, by this TIMUR in Asiatic lore.

Again, it is affirmed that I endeavour to conceal, under a profusion of epithet and ornament, "the scarcity of facts under which the narrative labours," p. 297. "This is most remarkable," he adds, "in the latter part of the sixth chapter, in which the embassies of Porus and Pandion to Augustus, the voluntary death of Zarmanochagus at Athens, the voyage of Iambulus, and a few other detached notices, are the only information we

receive on the subject of this history," (he means of India, which, however, in my title page and preface is declared not to be the *sole subject* of the history, for it professes also to include that of Bactria, Parthia, and other great empires on its western frontier, connected with it,) "though a rhetorical contrast of the splendour and character of Musicanus and Phraotes, two Indian kings, is placed, in the vacuum, in all the pomp of Asiatic diction." Ibid.

But I would here ask the more candid critic, am I accountable for this *scarcity of facts*, to be found in classical authors relative to India, or am I to be blamed for making the best use possible of the scanty materials contained in them? Let the Reviewer point out a writer on the subject, who has been passed unnoticed by me, in this attempt to elucidate her annals on the *firmest* basis yet attempted, I mean that of Arrian, Strabo, and other classical authors, for at present all other ground is suspicious. Such an history, arranged in the best order of which a subject necessarily so desultory would allow, (the chronological date being always given, where practicable, at the top of the page,) I was informed, by many respectable persons, would be acceptable to the literary world, however contemptible it may appear in the eyes of a *mere* Persic or Indian scholar, who mistakes the knowledge of Oriental languages, for a knowledge of Oriental science; and whose utmost energies are at once exerted and exhausted in a translation of a licentious song of

HAFEZ, or in detailing the ridiculous feats of the hero God ROSTAM. That world in general, if I may judge from the commendations of scholars of the first rank in literature, sent to me in letters from *English* universities, have not perceived those enormous defects which the Reviewer has been so anxious to discover, and so sedulous to display, in every page. It may be no improper *precursor* to such a complete work, founded on Sanscreet authority, as that at which he hints, if ever such a work shall be executed, but can never be rendered *nugatory* by it; and I can assure him nothing SHALL prevent my proceeding vigorously to the conclusion of it, with the best abilities I can exert, and from the best authorities *in my power* to obtain.

There runs, in fact, through the whole critique, such a mixture of apparent *sense* and positive *absurdity*, it contains such contradictory positions, there is manifested in it such a disposition to censure, and, as it were, such an *itch* for abuse, without allowing to the publication the least particle of merit, that I am convinced, as I have before hinted, it cannot be the production of one pen, but of a despicable JUNTO* of that sceptical class, whose

* I have reason to know that in consequence of the hostile representations of this inveterate junto, some of whose names have been mentioned to me, not a few booksellers in London connected with a certain *Northern Metropolis* have refused to vend my publications, and that they have been erased by others of the said junto from the lists of books usually recommended to be purchased by the younger branches of the Company's servants going out to India.

principles and opinions founded on those of Messrs. Bailli and Volney, my writings, supported by the irrefragable evidence of Sir W. Jones, were intended to oppose. These gentlemen, assembled in solemn conclave, have for some years past combined their malignant efforts to crush an author who, they well know, has toiled more than all of them together, in the wide field of Indian research, not indeed in learning the obsolete dialects of the country, for which task, being engaged in more pleasing and useful studies and pursuits, I never possessed either leisure, inclination, or indeed the necessary patience, but by diffusing, in my various publications, what the laborious exertions of that illustrious linguist, and other *really*, not *affectedly*, learned Orientalists have successively brought to light, from the stores of Eastern science, and making it useful to the best purposes to which human knowledge can be applied; especially during those distracted and anarchical periods in which my productions first solicited the notice of the public. If in those publications, my style has been sometimes rather too elevated, in consequence of an early *poetic* bias, it has often contributed to enliven subjects in their nature tedious and abstruse; and though they came out under every possible disparagement, yet have the works known by the title of Indian Antiquities and Ancient Indian History, contributed not a little to entertain and interest the literary world; nor are they, I am informed, at the present moment, by any

means the least popular books in the libraries, at least, of *South Britain.*

When I cast my eye on the *title* of this Review which has been so unmercifully severe upon my work, and read that it comes from the metropolis of Caledonia, I cannot avoid thinking it a little singular, and rather "indecorous," that the individuals of that nation which, more than any other, is known to have grown rich by the spoils of India, of that India which has almost been colonized by them for nearly a century past, and whose swollen red-book is filled with her chieftains and statesmen of high renown, that those who in the eager pursuit of wealth and of ambition, till an Englishman, the immortal Sir William Jones, arose to wake them from their golden slumber, and burst the bands of their luxurious indolence, neglected all the opportunities of informing themselves of the languages, the sciences, and the history of the Indians —that the supercilious critics of this nation, above all others, should labour to crush the well-meant efforts of an individual of South Britain, to elucidate them. The Monthly Reviewers, though in their survey of my work neither liberal nor candid, because it commences with personal reflections foreign to the subject, and talks much and absurdly about Ceylon, and a late Premier; yet is this Review ready enough to grant me that portion of applause which is certainly my due, for those well-meant efforts. They observe, that though mine is not *that Indian History* which is to descend down to posterity, (a conjecture remarkably civil; it will

not, however, be in the power of any *reviewers* to prevent it) yet they express " their unfeigned thanks to Mr. Maurice, for the large stores of knowledge which he has amassed, relative to a subject of great interest to the republic of letters, and of high and peculiar importance to this country."* Our high-flying Edinburgh Reviewer labours, throughout, to make me appear to his readers little better qualified than an ideot for the task of historical composition; arraigns my taste, attacks my judgment, and with a contemptuous sneer " commiserates my failure." p. 290. How little he himself is qualified to judge in this matter, and upon what a slender foundation these severe and arrogant strictures rest, will, I trust, be made evident, as I proceed in this extorted Vindication of the History of Modern India.

My title page, the reader will please to observe, and excuse the repetition of the remark, announces an Indian history *comprehending also that of the Greek Empire of Bactria, and other great Asiatic kingdoms, bordering on its western Frontier.* So far, therefore, are the details relating to those kingdoms, during the failure of a connected chain of Indian events, from being a *digression*, that they form a constituent part of the original plan and outline of the work, which was intended, LIKE THE ANCIENT PART, to present rather an enlarged view of the general History of Asia, as connected with Hindostan, than to exhibit the interior, domestic state of that country, during the centuries, immediately

* Monthly Review for June 1804, p. 148.

preceding and subsequent to the Christian æra. For the reasons recently assigned, it is extremely doubtful whether any such annals exist, even in the sacred sanctuary of Benares itself; it is still more doubtful, whether, if ever discovered, they will prove at all interesting to an European scholar; and after what has lately happened in the well known affair of the imposition in two remarkable instances by the Brahmins of that university, on so good an Indian scholar as Mr. Wilford, the suspicion of forgery *must for ever attach to them*, while we must, for a long period at least, receive what they choose to give us for Sanscreet, as *genuine*, though we are well acquainted with the doubtful authority, whence the documents come:

——— timeo Danaos, et dona ferentes.

It was in consequence of this impression, that in the same preface I publicly declared my fixed resolution throughout the relation, to adhere principally to classical authorities, however limited their details, or jejune the narration, where-ever they could be adduced, but not in the least neglecting any occasional light thrown on the subject by the recent discoveries of our countrymen, as in the particular instance of Sandracottus or Chandragupta, and his successor Allitrochades or Mitra-gupta. Vol. I. p. 21, et sub.

To critics, therefore, on this side of the Tweed, who, thank God! adhere to the rules of benevolence and justice, a little more strictly than those on the other, it must appear extremely uncandid

not to have cited, also, or at least to have given the substance of the following passage, which evinces that I had fully considered the subject, and made my option, whether right or wrong, in regard to the *mode* of executing the undertaking. The extract here subjoined, will, I dare say, subject me to the renewed imputation of self-sufficiency and an inflated style; but I have been at various times so insulted by the petulant opposition of those who *will not* perceive the avowed object of my undertaking, an undertaking not addressed to Indian so much as to classical scholars, who may wish for a summary connected account of whatever *useful* and *interesting* is at present known with respect to ancient and modern India, that I could not avoid feeling and occasionally expressing the indignation natural under such circumstances.

" After all, however an *historian* may lament the deficiency of materials for the domestic history of India, yet the mere contests of its rajahs for pre-eminence in their respective provinces, or even the grander efforts of the supreme sovereign, or Maharajah himself, to subjugate to his control the rebel chieftains of their haughty race, of which that history must principally consist, could not long or deeply interest the public mind. The same unvaried tale of insult and revenge, of victory and defeat, occurring in every successive reign, could not fail to weary by its repetition, and disgust by its uniformity: and, I am convinced, that the only truly interesting and instructive history of

India must be planned on that enlarged scale and that comprehensive view of the affairs of Asia, upon which it is here undertaken. Considered independently of its connection with the neighbouring empires, flourishing at the same period, the Seleucidian, the Parthian, the Bactrian, and, in later periods, the powerful Mohammedan kingdoms and dynasties that rolled their thunder round the mountains on its frontier, the history of India, instead of firing, as it ought, equally the soul of the writer and the reader, would sink to an insipid narrative, which others, than myself, might write, and persons of a different description from my patrons would probably peruse." Preface p. vii.

Such is the statement, which, in my humble opinion, previous to every reflection whatever on the contents of the volume, every critic of the least candour, ought to have given of the plan intended to be pursued, because the only one avowed by the author in writing the Indian History from the death of Alexander to the end of the eighteenth century. But, on the contrary, this stern Hyperborean Reviewer chalks out for me an outline of his own, assuming it as a ceded incontrovertible point, that a writer of a history of the period in question, ought to be master of the Sanscreet, the Persic, and the Arabic languages, but particularly of the former, because in its sacred bosom are locked up all the stores of the ancient history and sciences of Hindostan. At the same time he admits that this language "is nearly forgotten by the very order of men whose

interest it is to remember it; has, as yet, made no appearance, in Europe, under the form of a grammar and dictionary; lies dormant in the *thirty two* vocabularies of Panini; and adds, that it is probably doomed still to remain in the sacred original till some unfortunate individual (*like him who complains so feelingly, and so justly, of neglect in the* BAHAR-DANUSH) shall translate them into English, and print them at his own expense, to be rewarded with the thanks of the public, and the ruin of his health and fortune." Edin. Rev. p. 289.

What an excellent *logician* is this Caledonian hypercritic! for if ever there was encouragement held forth for some courageous writer of the day, unskilled in Asiatic languages, to stand forth, and present the public with an Indian History on the basis of the best documents afforded by classical writers, and what has been gleaned from Sanscreet books by the indefatigable exertions of Sir William Jones and others, it is decidedly afforded in the above passage. But this is not the only formidable obstacle to learning that Sanscreet, by an *intimate knowledge* of which a man can alone become a good Indian historian. Discussing the *disputed* point whether the Brahmins or the Bhoodists (*absurdly* disputed, because no real Indian scholar could ever yield the palm of priority to the Bhoodists, but this subject shall be more particularly considered presently) were the more ancient sects in India, he affirms that "the Brahmins *are known to have* FORGED *many books*, to maintain the antiquity of their own sect."

p. 293. It is happy for the progress of Asiatic literature that there are men in India, undaunted enough to undertake the learning of the Sanscreet tongue; but I think no European scholar in his right senses, though with very high objects of ambition and glory before him, could sit down with satisfaction to learn the "thirty-two vocabularies" of a language in which such damning frauds have been practised, subversive of all genuine historical fact, and tending to throw the veil of suspicion over the most important and interesting events? To engage in such a hopeless task, in any case would be *absurd;* but to enter on it, as our critic observes, "with the almost certain ruin of his health and fortune," would be INSANITY.

If ever, therefore, a knowledge of the Sanscreet tongue, sufficient for the purpose of detailing the internal history of the country, is to be attained, it must be in India itself; but the life of Methuselah, according to the idea of our Reviewer, and the hundred eyes of Argus, seem necessary to the adventurous historian, who may thus emerge from the *distant womb of time*, since he sees no signs of such an one at present. "For before any writer" (hear him!) "shall favour the literary republic with a history of India, worthy of its thanks and approbation, he must explore every scrap of information, in *every language which Asia possesses*, from the deserts of Tartary, the country of Gengis and Timur, to the promontories of Malabar and Malacca." p. 301. Indispensable, therefore, to

this literary phœnomenon, seems to be the age of the first mentioned venerable personage, for the purpose of toiling through those innumerable MSS. volumes written in every dialect of ransacked Asia, which he asserts to be so absolutely necessary to form the perfect Indian historian, while all the eyes of the second renowned character in ancient fable, seem to be not less important to him for discovering what may, or may not be in Sanscreet, the interpolation of the Brahmins, without acuteness in discriminating which, the whole project must prove abortive. But with all due deference to the extended calculations of the Indian Brahmins, with respect to the life of man in the *Satya Yug*, by them recorded to have reached a thousand years, as those of a very few persons in this miserable *Cali* age, exceed the term of one hundred years, a gloom still more doubtful and obscure is thrown over so desirable an event, and no Indian history *upon his plan* will probably be composed, till by frequent wars and ill-judged ambitious efforts at conquest, we shall have at length taught the Indians to fight as well as ourselves, and not a foot of land in Asia may remain to us, to render that history an object of the least curiosity. What interest will then be excited by the details of the exploits of the great emperors of the SOLAR and LUNAR dynasties, or those of MAGADHA, MAURYA, SUNGA, and an hundred other barbarous dynasties,* whose perfidies and murders render their memories

* See catalogues of the kings of these dynasties, (MAGNI NOMINIS UMBRA), in the ancient Indian History. Vol. II. p. 96.

execrable to all posterity, and over which an eternal oblivion ought rather to be spread.

Let any dispassionate person peruse the few concise abstracts made by Sir W. Jones and Mr. Wilford, from Sanscreet authorities, of these imperial families, each rising to empire on the wanton massacre of the former, all stained with the blood, and black with the crimes of their predecessors: let him recollect that these sanguinary transactions took place in an insulated region of Asia, without throwing any additional light upon its sciences, or tending in the least to illustrate its general history; let him read the uninteresting, the disgusting portions of provincial history, affixed to the account of the Soubahs, in that standard book of all genuine information, relative to India two centuries ago, written by Abul Fazil, the secretary of Akber, and the most learned Mahommedan of his day in Asia, with all the means, and all the opportunities of correct information upon the subject, from having access to the "archives of the nation," whose domestic history he was anxious to record, but which from the specimens there given, in which miracles, and matters of historical verity are absurdly blended together, and gods and men constantly act upon the same theatre: let him read, I say, *(if he can keep his eyes open)* these professedly *historical* narrations, without any reference to the older Sanscreet mythological histories that relate the wanderings and battles of the PALLIS and the PANDUS, with whose ridiculous adventures their ancient volumes are stuffed; and

I am sure he will thank me for adhering rather to classical than Indian narration, and commend me for not wasting the best portion of life in studies, which, however serviceable in India, can prove neither useful nor interesting in Europe.

The particular utility of an acquaintance with the languages of Asia, to a person resident in India, is, that, it will infallibly advance his fortune, and, till Sir W. Jones visited India, to that purpose it was solely and invariably applied. But, in this country, according to the Reviewer, a knowledge of Oriental languages and the practical application of them to useful and scientific purposes, will inevitably lead to the "ruin of health and fortune." The passage from which those words are cited in a former page, is so curious in its argument, and holds forth such decisive encouragement to the student of Asiatic lore, that, to avoid *his* crime of partial quotation to serve a purpose, I here present it to the reader unabridged.

"Many disagreeable obstacles have opposed, and still continue to retard, our progress in Asiatic literature. Leaving out of consideration the peculiar views and qualifications of most of those who go to India, almost every student is subjected to the obvious disadvantage of leaving Europe without any knowledge of the Hindoo languages. If it require a long space of time to become master of Persic, how much more is required to make an ordinary proficiency in Bengalee, Hindostanee, and the other dialects in common use? All these must be acquired in India, as there is no seminary in

Britain where they can be tolerably learned. But even these, when attained, are of very little advantage to an Indian antiquary or historian. The Sanscrit, the literary language of that country, the guardian of all its ancient knowledge, has never left the sacred spot, beyond the precincts of which Brahmins are forbidden to travel, nor made its appearance in Europe under the form of a grammar and dictionary. The dying hand of Sir William Jones has as yet pointed out in vain to his countrymen the labours of Pânini, and the thirty-two native vocabularies, which are probably destined to remain in the sacred original till some unfortunate individual shall translate them into English, and print them at his own expense, to be rewarded with the thanks of the public, and the ruin of his health and fortune." p. 289.

Why then do these censorious dictators so severely condemn me for not having learned the Persic and Arabic languages, when by their own confession, even the familiar knowledge of them, together with the Bengalee, Hindostanee, and the other barbarous dialects in common use, would be wholly insufficient for the purpose of any genuine original history of India, without the knowledge of Sanscreet also, the key, that can alone unlock its sacred, but buried treasures; and for that awful task, were I even so inclined, there exists in Europe neither grammar nor dictionary. These are very hard taskmasters indeed, but, thank God! I am not obliged to submit to their iron yoke. After all, when the Sanscreet, together

with Persian and Arabic, shall have been attained by any writer, how much do these gentlemen differ in opinion from the President, who declares, in his tenth anniversary discourse, that even in the work of a writer thus qualified, in Asiatic history *truth* and *fiction* are so blended, " we could only give absolute credence to the general outline."*

The reader will in this place please to pause with me for a moment, and observe the great inconsistency of this writer, as well as his great unfairness in argument, who is criticising a *modern* history of Hindostan, yet goes out of the way in his indiscriminate abuse of my performance, to stigmatize my ignorance of Sanscreet; of *that* language which he himself acknowledges to be obsolete, " and almost forgotten by the Brahmins themselves," p. 259, and consequently with which the modern history of India, in the sense assigned by him to the word *modern*, has no more to do than with the fabled language of Formosa, or the Houyhnhnms, to which latter indeed, by its επεα ιπποβαμενα or, *words that ride upon horses*, its prancing high sounding poly-syllables often stretching through half a barren page, it may be supposed to bear some remote resemblance. If this adorer of the Sanscreet muses had not denominated my words " sesquipedalian," and throughout endeavoured to represent my language as to the last degree inflated, I should not have thus dared to assail the sacred entrenchments of his favourite dialect, the grand depository of all Indian

* Asiatic Researches, Vol. IV. p. 7. London quarto edit.

science and history. Heartily do I wish that the advantages thus ardently expected from its more diffused cultivation, may accord with his wishes, but in my humble opinion that never will be the case, till a man of Sir William Jones's sublime, expanded, comprehensive genius, shall again arise, with the unbounded range of his mind in general science, to render it useful, and with his penetrating acumen to detect *imposture*. The real meaning however of all this jargon about Sanscreet is, not that a very interesting and useful history of India cannot be written without the least acquaintance with that obsolete tongue, but say the Indian junto, who have set up an imperial standard for the kingdom of literature, at Edinburgh, that new Benares, that nobler Delhi, whose lofty colleges and palaces declare their Asiatic origin, "nothing *shall* prosper that does not emane from ourselves; no mere English scholar shall presume to undertake such a work; the country is ours, and the history can only flow correct from our recording pens."

In fact, of the two last centuries, by far the most interesting of any to European readers, the history may be found detailed with very tolerable accuracy, at least sufficiently so, for all the purposes of general information, which is all that I ever intended, in the pages of enlightened European travellers during that period into India; Sir Thomas Roe, Herbert, Terry, Fryer, and the French writers Thevenot, Tavernier, and in particular Bernier, whose account is uncommonly minute, interesting, and correct; Fraser's Mogul

Emperors and Nadir Shah, Jones's Nadir Shah, the native historian, Golam Hussain, translated from Persian into English, sufficiently correct for my purpose, with Orme, and other later historians, and innumerable living eye witnesses of the transactions in India during the last forty years, are very genuine and abundant sources of information, where it is not necessary, nor indeed, as I must constantly aver, a *part of the plan*, to go into very minute details. From these, but I say not these only, for I have besides many valuable MSS. and printed documents, over which my official situation gives me command, if I am not quite the ideot this strenuous advocate for Sanscreet lore would make me appear, I hope to compose that history in a manner satisfactory to my friends, and honourable to myself.

On this subject, however, the ever-recurring objection of my assailants, my ignorance of the Asiatic languages; though I am by no means amenable to the Edinburgh divan, yet, as I am now voluntarily before the tribunal of the public, and as it doubtless must appear to many respectable and reflecting readers somewhat presumptuous to have undertaken an Oriental history without a competent knowledge of the Asiatic languages, a crime so loudly and incessantly rung in my ears, I beg to be candidly heard, and I shall proceed, with the utmost explicitness, to state my reasons, or rather my apology, for the case seems in reality to require one, for that presumption.

Under my ever respected friend and master,

Dr. Parr, I can boast to have received a tolerable education, principally in the line of classical literature, and at Oxford under two very distinguished SCHOLARS, now of high rank in life, completed those studies which, I trusted, might render me sufficiently accomplished to enter upon any historical undertaking for which adequate *materials* were to be found. Before I entered Oxford, some very early poetical efforts of mine had recommended me to the notice of Dr. Johnson, and Sir W. Jones; and the latter of these great men being himself particularly attached to the Muses, and a fellow of my own college, I was induced eagerly to cultivate his approbation and friendship, with a portion of which he condescended to honour me. A letter lies before me of an early date, written to me soon after I had entered into orders, which will prove that he was not indifferent to my interests; and I the rather insert it, because it has been publicly said by my rude opponents, that in my works I have boasted of an intimacy with that great man which, in fact, never existed.

Temple, 20th December 1781.

Dear Sir,

Nothing but a severe illness, from which I am slowly recovering, should have prevented me from sooner acknowledging the receipt of your obliging letter. I grieve, that you should have called in vain at my chambers, and hope you make all due allowances for a professional man. How can you think any apology necessary for what

you mention to me? Among my acquaintance there are unfortunately very few clergymen; to those, whom I know in London, I will not fail to speak of you and your wishes; and have already commissioned an active friend of mine to ask his clerical acquaintance, if they know of a vacant curacy in the neighbourhood of London. I should think, that I conferred no small obligation upon any clergyman by recommending *you*; but, circumstanced as I am, I fear I can be of little use to you. I will certainly omit no opportunity of showing how truly I am, dear Sir,

Your friend and hearty well-wisher,

W. JONES.

I afterwards received other letters from him, equally obliging. When he sailed for India our correspondence for some time ceased, but both myself and others, who witnessed in this country the ardour of his pursuits in Oriental science, kept our eyes steadily fixed upon him in his exalted station there, and at length beheld, what we had long expected, his learning and his genius break forth in a new work that spread a lustre over the quarter of the world honoured by his residence, the *Asiatic Researches*. Several volumes of this interesting work appeared in Europe, before I formed the least idea of undertaking to write any thing on the subject of India; but when the GEETA, which I first saw with astonishment, at Mr. Nathaniel Smith's, the kind patron both of Mr. Wilkins and myself, the HEETOPADES,

and the SACONTALA, successively appeared, together with other publications tending to elucidate the theological and civil code of India, as well as the arts and sciences, and peculiar customs and manners of that ancient people; I undertook, after an attentive re-perusal of Hyde de Religione Veterum Persarum, between which religion and the Brahmin I remarked a striking resemblance, and many other Oriental writers made familiar to us in translations by authors, properly qualified for the arduous undertaking, to extend to Asia in general the observations made in that work, and to draw that parallel between the religion, laws, literature, &c. of India, Egypt, Persia, and Greece, which forms the subject of the seven volumes of the Indian Antiquities; a work which, I must beg permission to repeat, whatever may be its accidental errors, secured me the applause and patronage of some of the most distinguished characters in literature, which this country can boast, though its success excited against me the envy and active hostility of a few mere Indian and Persian linguists, who by an easy and natural self-delusion, were betrayed into the venial error, of mistaking, as I had before occasion to observe, the knowledge of Oriental *characters* for a knowledge of Oriental *literature*.

On this subject, what says one of the most accomplished scholars in that line, that the world ever produced? Though skilled in nearly all the languages of Asia and Europe, he repeatedly declared in his addresses to the Society, that languages are not *science*, but the *medium* by which

science is conveyed. "I have ever considered languages as the mere instruments of real learning, and think them improperly confounded with learning itself."* For my own part, having an unconquerable aversion to that barren study, I early resolved to follow his advice elsewhere given, and gather the fruit of the tree of science, without incumbering myself with the leaves and branches.† With very profound respect for the compilers of grammars, and dictionaries, and with adequate gratitude for the patient drudgery of those laudable pioneers in literature, I beg to be excused the labour of poring over them; a labour neither suitable to my eyes nor agreeable to my disposition. The rugged thorn disgusts and terrifies me, but, like the nightingale of Hafez, I am delighted with the odour and beauty of the expanding rosebud.

At the same time I candidly confess, this my contumacious conduct relative to acquiring a knowledge of the hieroglyphic alphabets of Asia, was in direct opposition to the repeated injunctions of the President himself, who advised me, at the very outset, to make myself master of the Persian language, sufficiently so at least to translate Ferishta, in a letter of which the following is a part.

Chrishna-Nagar, 10th October, 1790.

Dear Sir,

It is not possible for me to forget the pleasure which I have received from your conversation, and the opinion which I always en-

* Asiatic Researches, Vol. I. p. 14. London, quarto edition.
† Ibid. Vol. I. p. 355.

tertained of your parts and industry. The arduous undertaking, of which I have just perused the plan, fully justifies my opinion; but I am so oppressed with a heavy arrear of business, that I cannot write at large on the subject of it. I will desire my agent in London to subscribe for me, and will do all I can to promote the subscription here. Such is the expense of printing at Calcutta, that it would cost thirty pounds sterling to reprint the pamphlet; but the proposals shall be reprinted, and carefully circulated. I am confident that you might learn Persian in six months, (if you have not learned it already,) so well at least as to read the original text of Ferishta, whose work, with submission, is very *highly esteemed* by all learned Indians and Indian scholars. To an historian I must express every truth, even though friendship might induce me to conceal it; * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *. Let me, at the same time, exhort you not wholly to rely on *my* authority; for, though I have diligently avoided errors, yet I have made many: for instance, *Por*, a word which I found for *Porus* in the Shah-Nameh, is, I now find, pronounced *Pur*, or *Poor*, by the native Persians; and I have reason to believe, from Sanscrit authorities, that the true name of that prince was PAURAVA. If you read Persian, Mr. Boughton Rouse will, I dare say, lend you the Modern History of India, by Gholam Husain. Farewell, my Dear Sir, and believe me to be, with great regard,

Your ever faithful humble servant,

WILLIAM JONES.

In consequence of this and another letter, of great extent and equal explicitness, relative to my undertaking, in which he informed me that Mr. W. Chambers (the brother of Sir Robert) had accumulated an immense mass of materials for *an History of India*, but which Sir William asserted his conviction he never *could* find leisure to compose, and wished them, together with *his* knowledge of the Indian and Persian languages, in my possession, I did sit down with the intent of making myself master of the Persian tongue, as far as recommended in the above letter; from a perseverance in which, however, I was deterred partly by the total want of MSS. as well as the great expense of procuring them; and partly by Mr. Halhed, with whom I had the honour of living on familiar terms, as well as some other Persic scholars, whom I also had *then* the happiness to rank among the number of my friends, offering me the occasional aid of their learned pens, to translate for me any passages of peculiar importance to my infant undertaking. The premature death of *one* of these learned Orientalists, and the total desertion of the Indian Muses by the *other*, events that never can be too deeply deplored, left me in a state bordering on despondency; but I could not then desert my engagements with the public, in completing the Indian Antiquities. I was compelled to proceed; and till this unprovoked and illiberal attack, have largely experienced the candour and patronage of the public. What I actually promised I have performed, and that public has crowned

my labours with applause. The intricate, arduous, and almost impracticable part which the Reviewer has pointed out for me, I never engaged to execute; and, therefore, his affected *commiseration of my failure*, is equally insidious, impertinent, and malevolent.

The Reviewer, though perfectly aware that an Oriental history to be gleaned, as my history avowedly was, from fragments dispersed through numerous volumes, composed in various ages, and by authors, of widely different nations, could not possibly be distinguished in a very eminent degree by that *lucidus ordo*, and close connexion of parts which must prevail where a regular series of incidents and authenticated records is to be met with, as in the history of European states, yet ostentatiously exhibits the Ciceronian precepts for writing history, and examines it by rules to which I contend Asiatic History is by no means amenable; rules alone strictly applicable where abundant *materials* and a variety of authors, who have preceded its commencement, render selection possible, and the path of the historian less perplexed with doubt, and encumbered with difficulties. The details, so constantly recurring in all Asiatic history, of battles, sieges, public and private massacres, leave little room for extensive remarks into the *causes of events*, or profound philosophical reflections upon their *consequences*. As far, doubtless, as possible, should a *lucid arrangement* and a *chronological order*, in the detail of facts, be adhered to; but to obey the other part of Cicero's admonition, to penetrate

the secret *counsels* of Asiatic tyrants, or fully developе their *views* and *characters*, especially at such a great distance of time, is utterly impossible.* The rise and fall of kingdoms in the East are not marked by those regular gradations in glory and disgrace, by which those of the western world are distinguished, nor afford such scope for the display of the intellectual powers of the contemplative historian. In one short age they, sometimes, attain the highest pinnacle of power and grandeur; in another, not a vestige shall remain either of the kingdom, or the dynasty that governed it. It should be remembered, also, that tyrants, such as Eastern monarchs generally are, act mostly from the spontaneous impulse of the moment. As frantic in conceiving, as rapid in the execution of their wild projects of sanguinary ambition; they leave to the sagacity of the historian no deep political *counsels* to be investigated, nor instructive moral reflections, on the *results* of those projects,

* The well known passage in Cicero, which I suppose referred to by the Reviewer, is added below.

Rerum ratio ordinem temporum desiderat, regionum descriptionem: vult etiam, quoniam in rebus magnis memoriâque dignis *consilia* primùm, deinde *acta*, posteà *eventus* expectantur; et de *consiliis* significari quid scriptor probet, et in *rebus gestis* declarari non solùm *quid* actum aut dictum sit, sed etiam *quo modo;* et, cùm de *eventu* dicatur, ut causæ explicentur omnes vel casûs, vel sapientiæ, vel temeritatis; hominumque ipsorum non solùm res gestæ, sed etiam, qui famâ ac nomine excellant, de cujusque vitâ atque naturâ. *Verborum* autem ratio, et genus orationis fusum atque tractum, et cum lenitate quadam æquabili profluens, sine hac judiciali asperitate, et sine sententiarum forensium aculeis, persequendum est. *De Orat.* Lib. II. p. 117, edit. 1714.

to be inculcated. The unvaried tenor of their atrocity, often unmitigated by a single ray of virtue, fills us with one uniform sentiment of disgust and horror. Their *principles* can only be mentioned to be detested; their *example* only to be dreaded and avoided.

Notwithstanding, however, the difficulty, or rather utter impossibility of composing a narration of this desultory kind in exact conformity to a classic model, our rigid critic demands a history that shall contain "a statement of causes, the whole arranged in a manner to delight the mind by unity of subject, skilful connexion of parts, and accuracy and depth in the occasional reflections and observations." Page 291. For examples of this kind of historical writing, among the moderns, with whom alone a modern history can have any concern, he refers us to Voltaire, Robertson, and Hume, writers in full possession of all those accumulated advantages enumerated above, but of which scarcely one was attainable by me.

Among the ancient writers of history, the sources whence Cicero derived these precepts, and the objects of his merited commendation, Herodotus and Thucydides are referred to, and to their venerated names, I was early taught, under no incompetent master of Greek literature, to bow down with veneration; but common candour should have led the Reviewer to consider, that, of these the former had an advantage which no writer of an History of India, except of the events of the last

century, could have enjoyed. Herodotus lived very near, and almost in the times in which the events which he records were transacted; he had, also, visited the countries which were the scene of those events, and examined the evidence for and against most of the facts recited upon the spot. Thucydides, in this respect, had still more important advantages in composing that history, upon which the great orator of Rome, in his second book, *De Oratore*, lavishes such unbounded praise. For, being situated in the midst of the scenes pourtrayed, and no uninterested actor in the events which his eloquent pen describes, lucid arrangement, chronological accuracy, an investigation into the *causes* and *results* of important facts, were fully in his power; the secret *counsels* and respective *characters* of the contending chiefs of Athens and Lacedæmon were intimately known to him. The limits too, in point of time, by which their histories are bounded, should also be considered; that of Herodotus being comprised within a period of about two centuries and an half; and that of the Peloponesian war, not exceeding a period of twenty-one years, while my more comprehensive plan professes to give a general view of interesting transactions in the southern regions of the vast continent of Asia, connected with India, from the first dawn of civilization on that continent, according to the Mosaic scriptures, and the most esteemed prophane authorities, to the close of the eighteenth century. Is a task like this to be thus severely reprobated; a task undertaken with the

best views, and in the most anarchical periods, when the most audacious attempts were made by Gallic philosophers abroad, and those who had adopted their disorganizing principles at home, to convulse all civilized society, to establish the wild Brahminical reveries respecting the uncounted millions of years, which, in express contradiction both to reason and revelation, the world is said to have existed, on the ruin, (for that must be the inevitable consequence of the subversion of the doctrines of revealed religion,) on the total extinction of every thing sacred and moral in Europe. For this am I to be hunted down by a sceptical junto, and represented by their calumniating pens, as utterly incapable of arranging an historical subject, without taste, without judgment, and particularly "unqualified for an historian of India," by a writer that knows, perhaps, no more of Sanscreet than I pretend to do, since there is but one person, in England, Mr. Wilkins, who is said to be acquainted with it's dialects; for this are the laborious researches of many years into the antiquities, not of India only, but of Asia, to be degraded and ridiculed, and the greater part of a most expensive publication reduced to waste paper on the shelf of the bookseller!

This malignant, but I trust, ineffectual effort wholly to crush a work undertaken in *such times*, and with *such views*, is more particularly cruel and dastardly, because when I originally commenced the ancient India, well persuaded of the innumerable difficulties which I had to encounter, and

the dangerous and uncertain ground upon which I had to advance, when I left the classic page of Herodotus, Diodorus Siculus, Arrian and Strabo, for the broken traditions and mutilated fragments of history, to be gleaned in a research into its native annals, as detailed by learned Europeans, I appealed to the indulgence of the public in the following passage, which the impartial candour of a generous critic ought not, in his rage to criminate, have passed unnoticed; for this extract, also, stands prominent in the first page of the preface of that work.

" While I present the Public with the first Volume of the Indian History, during the most *ancient* periods, I think it necessary thus early to enter my protest against all attempts to judge the pages of the following work by the rules of criticism, which are applied to *history in general.* To those rules, an investigation of this extensive nature, pointing towards æras so remote, and illustrative of events at once so complicated, and so deeply buried in the gulf of time, is by no means amenable."

The title page also marked its deviation from the general plan on which history is conducted, professing to detail THE HISTORY OF HINDOSTAN; ITS ARTS, AND ITS SCIENCES, AS CONNECTED WITH THE HISTORY OF THE OTHER GREAT EMPIRES OF ASIA, DURING THE MOST ANCIENT PERIODS OF THE WORLD."

It seems however, by the Edinburgh standard of criticism, at least, that an author can no longer

be permitted to mark out for himself the outline of any work which he may meditate, or of the limits by which his prudence may lead him to bound, or his temerity to extend his excursion in the wide field of literary research. The Reviewer must hold the line of demarcation, and let the author transgress it at his peril. The direst anathemas of critical vengeance, infallibly attend the slightest deviation. Not having the fear of that vengeance before my eyes, I boldly formed a model of my own, and adhering to that model, by it only, and not by one formed on classical rules, which I again contend are foreign to desultory Asiatic histories, my performance ought to be judged. In England, my appeal was heard, and the solicited indulgence granted, but it seems not to have softened the adamant of Caledonian obduracy.

Every person that has attentively perused the history in question, must know that it had higher objects in view, than a mere narration of events however important and interesting, that occurred in the earliest ages. It commenced with professing to be composed on a more comprehensive scale, than any preceding historical effort not avowedly *general;* and to take a wide range in the history and affairs of Asia—to explore the origin and trace the progress of superstition, especially the *solar and sidereal*, among those eastern nations from whom its bright but delusive ray first emaned to bewilder mankind,—to mark the gradual advance of the human mind in arts, and sciences, particularly in those for which the Indians were so highly

and insidiously celebrated, to suit their own nefarious purposes, by Messrs. Bailli and Volney, their vaunted astronomy and chronology, founded on the basis of fabulous AVATARS, of which the glaring absurdities were *effectually* exposed, and their gross exaggeration, in consequence of their computing time, by *the bright and dark halves of the moon's disc*, in other words by reckoning a fortnight for a year, were proved by incontrovertible evidence.*

It was the object, also, of that work, the Ancient India, however the idea may be scouted by the Reviewer, to show the marked features of similitude between the Mosaic and Hindoo systems in respect to the *Creation*, the *Fall of Man*, the *general Deluge* and a great variety of other points, both of a

* See Ancient Indian History, Vol. I. Cap. 4. et seq. Menses in quinos denos INDI descripserunt dies. Lunæ cursu notant tempora, *non ut plerique quum orbem sidus implevit; sed quum se curvare cœpit in cornua:* et idcirco *breviores* habent menses, qui spatium eorum *ad hunc lunæ modum dirigunt.* (Quintus Curtius, lib. viii. cap. 9.) Or, the *Indian* month consists of *fifteen days:* they indeed compute their time by the course of the *moon, but not, as most other nations do, when that planet hath completed her period; but when she begins to contract her sphere into horns;* and therefore, they must necessarily have *shorter months,* who regulate their time according *to this measure of lunar calculation.* The important intelligence contained in this remarkable passage, I found confirmed in Mr. Wilkins's notes to the Heetopades, in these words: "The Hindoos divide the lunar month into what they denominate the *Sookla paksha* and the *Creeshna paksha,* that is, *the light side* and *the dark side of the moon;* the former commencing with the *new* moon, and the latter at the *full.*" Note on the Heetopades, p. 302.

physical and theological nature; the former, as it was there contended, descending down to us by the pure unadulterated stream of divine revelation, the latter by the dark and corrupted channel of human tradition. The cause was laboured with zeal and sincerity, and, however weak the instrument, the defence of the national religion was honoured with no small share of the national applause.

Indignant, however, at this attempt, by one unlearned in Sanscreet grammar, to reconcile the Indian and Scriptural statements, and forgetting that the same sources of information were open to me, as to himself, in the learned writings and researches of Sir W. Jones, of Mr. Wilkins, Captain Wilford, Mr. Davis, and other Sanscreet scholars, who drank their information at the fountain head of Indian science, and who were, throughout, my authorities where any subject directly Sanscreet is introduced, the disciple of Hume and of Volney at one blow, endeavours to batter to pieces the whole fabric of my elaborate narration, and declares his utter discredit of all that has been written on the subject by the most learned *English* etymologists for a number of years, on the *south of the Tweed*. He asserts positively, "that any mass of fable may be reconciled with Scripture history, by the vague and illogical plan of reasoning, which Mr. Maurice has generally used." p. 294. But he forgets that this same kind of reasoning was previously used, relative to the same subject, by Sir William Jones; that my deductions are principally

founded on those reasonings; and that it is not so much upon any train of *argument* whatever, that the earlier statements in my book depend, but on the production of *evidence*, connected, powerful, demonstrative evidence, delineated aloft in emblematic paintings that adorn the walls of the oldest pagodas and the most venerated cavern-temples of India, most of them at no inconsiderable expense engraved in the volumes which he thus severely criticises—the NARAYEN of India, or sacred spirit, floating on the primordial waters, to whom Sir William has addressed one of the sublimest odes in any language; and the MATSYA, VARA, COURMA, and BALI, Avatars so pointedly decisive in their allusions to the deluge, and the succeeding awful event at Babel. In discussions of this abstruse nature, intimately connected too with mythology, arguments and proofs strictly logical are entirely out of the question, nor would they by any candid critic be demanded. It is only by duly weighing and comparing together, all the facts and evidence submitted, that a just judgment can be formed, and a right conclusion drawn on the subject. Those facts are numerous, and that evidence forcible; the result is left to the discriminating mind of the unprejudiced reader. Whatever a supercilious Scotch Reviewer may think of my mode of reasoning, I am proud again to repeat, that there are those of the most distinguished rank and talents that southern Britain can boast, and not a few of the more liberal of his own nation, who have honoured my labours in that

field of Asiatic research with the warmest and most decided approbation; nor need I, at this late period, mention the honourable public testimonies in my favour of the learned author of the Pursuits of Literature, of that excellent scholar and prelate the Lord Bishop of Lincoln, and that gratifying proof of desert, the LETTER sent by the late venerable Archbishop of Canterbury, and that most eminent and able judge of classical excellence, the late Earl of Rosslyn, a man far above the prejudices of clime or country, to the East India Directors, in the most express terms recommending that very work to the patronage of the Court.

The real sentiments of the Reviewer on these subjects are plainly and without disguise unfolded in the following passage, in which he seems perfectly united in opinion with Mr. Volney, who, in a note on his celebrated "RUINS," has some very extraordinary strictures on the tenth chapter of Genesis, and the *hypothesis* (if it must be called *hypothesis)* to which the genealogical history of Noah's progeny contained in it so justly gave birth. Those strictures shall presently be adduced, and will serve as an excellent elucidatory comment upon it. In combating my "illogical" arguments resulting from all the evidence in my power to collect, that the theology of the Indians was not borrowed from the Egyptians, in which opinion, I believe, very few real Indian scholars, who have duly considered the singular stamp of the theological code and ritual of Hindostan will differ

from me; and after some remarks on the resemblance, in certain particular points of doctrine and worship between the two systems, which I considered as the remains of a code common to both in those early periods, when the patriarchal was the sole religion of the earth, he insultingly observes, "If Mr. Maurice be disposed to believe in the vague similarities and reasoning on these subjects exhibited in his own writings, we may admire his faith, but certainly cannot adopt it. On the topic of primeval *Cuthite profanation* we are exceedingly distrustful, the more so perhaps, because we recognize in it a well-known hypothetical principle, fabricated from the genealogy in the 10th chapter of the first book of Moses, and from a few passages in the Greek poets. It is advanced, we believe, in the most extensive manner in Bryant's Antient Mythology; and we have found it in all the books, one or two excepted, which have been written on patriarchal history, for a number of years, on the other side of the Tweed. It is supported by a mass of false etymology from the Hebrew, Coptic, Persic, and sometimes Indian languages, of which the authors often know little more than a few words, and these, especially the Hebrew, in no very accurate shape, having passed through the Hutchinsonian media of Parkhurst and Bates." p. 293.

The only just hypothesis that can be founded on the 10th chapter of Genesis, is, that, from Noah and his three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japhet, the whole existing race of mankind is descended, and

that among them and their immediate posterity, so accurately and minutely enumerated by the inspired historian, was the whole earth peopled, or to use his own words, *by these were the nations divided after the flood.* Gen. x. 31. This chapter is properly considered as the basis of all that is sound and solid, in what concerns the geography and history of ancient kingdoms and nations; and the admirable illustrations of the profoundly learned Bochart, together with those of an immortal band of commentators who preceded him, in the path of geography and sacred history, have amply established its unshaken verity. The distinction made by Christian divines and historians between the lives of the virtuous Shem, and the profligate race of Ham; in the former of which the true religion was cherished and upheld, but in the latter obscured and lost, amidst the migration of his Cuthite descendants, has its foundation in holy writ, and, if the worthy and venerable Mr. Bryant have in some instances (as will readily be conceded) carried his etymological deductions too far, or raised upon them a structure which they will not bear, the other portions of his valuable work will long remain a towering column of his virtue, his learning, and his fame. The whole of this chapter, however, being in a particular manner hostile to the system of those determined sceptics who consider revealed religion as a *farce*, and reject prophecy, with which it has in many parts of it an intimate connection, *as an insult to the human understanding*, has been attacked with

uncommon virulence by unbelievers in all ages. M. Volney, the most inveterate of any, against the Mosaic, as indeed against all other religious codes, roundly asserts, and offers to demonstrate, that this chapter "which treats of the *pretended* generations of the *man called Noah*, is a real geographical picture of the world, as it was known to the Hebrews at the *epoch of the captivity*," at which period he had before asserted the Mosaic history was *forged*. He adds, that "all the *pretended* personages, from Adam to Abraham or his father Terah, are mythological beings, stars, constellations, countries; Adam is Bootes, Noah is Osiris,* &c. &c. &c.

After thus annihilating, as he fancied, the Mosaic system, M. Volney proceeds in his infamous career of abuse, and, in another part of the same volume, impiously attempts to mythologize away the whole of the Christian system, by insisting that the history and miracles of Christ were borrowed from those of the Indian Creeshna. According to that hypothesis, the holy Offspring of the Virgin means only the solar orb rising in the sign Virgo, the *twelve* Apostles are the *twelve* zodiacal asterisms, while the very name Jesus is as impiously traced to YES, *the ancient cabalistical name of the young Bacchus*." †

To these unparalleled blasphemies I alone, *when every Indian and Persic scholar was dumb*, stood forward to reply. As I was then engaged in writing the History of Ancient India, as far as I could

* Volney's Ruins, page 348.

† Ruins, page 292.

collect that History from classical writers, compared with recent accounts by our own countrymen, exploring the Sanscreet mine, I should have been inexcusable, patronised as I was by the most illustrious characters in the Church and the State, to have passed them by unnoticed; and hence that extended life of the Indian Creeshna, from Halhed's MS. in the British Museum, found its way into my page, that I might display the real character of that vaunted Indian deity, so impiously compared in his birth, name, and miracles, with the Saviour of the world. The injudiciousness of admitting that curious fragment, was by the more rigid critic condemned; but as Creeshna is universally acknowledged to be the principal AVATAR, as the history itself was highly entertaining and was never from so authentic a document detailed before in Europe, by more candid critics its insertion was commended. I was gratified by finding it had its full effect, and no more such impious comparisons have been since drawn between the Christian and Indian preserver.

After the history of the AVATARS was concluded, and that of the first settlers in Asia, and founders of Asiatic empires, and particularly the *Indian* empire came to be investigated, I could not avoid being struck at finding the domestic name of India in the oldest Sanscreet books to be CUSHA-DWEEPA, or the *continent of Cush*; and that of Egypt to be Misra-stahn, or the region of Misra; that a distinguished personage named Rama,

was the acknowledged founder of the Indian empire, and Bali or Belus, a prince of high renown in the page of their earliest history. I could not avoid being thus struck, because they are names that are most conspicuous in the genealogy of this 10th chapter, and the intelligence neither came through the channel of the doubtful Bryant, or the "Hutchinsonian media of Parkhurst or Bates," which authors, having higher authorities on the subject to refer to, I know not that I ever once consulted, or referred to, in all my writings concerning Asiatic subjects. It came from the highest attainable authority, Sir William Jones himself, who in his Supplement to the Indian Chronology, after repeating, from various and increased evidence, his confirmed opinion that the Mosaic and Indian chronologies are perfectly consistent, that MENU, son of BRAHMA, was the Adima, or first created mortal, and consequently our ADAM; that MENU, child of the Sun, was preserved, with *seven* others, in a bahitra, or capacious ark, from an universal deluge, and must therefore be our NOAH; and that HIRANYACASIPU, the giant with a golden axe, and BALI, were impious and arrogant monarchs, and, most probably, our NIMROD and BELUS; adds, that he is strongly inclined to believe, that the three Ramas, two of whom were invincible warriors, and the third, not only valiant in war, but the patron of agriculture and wine, which derives an epithet from his name, were only three different representations of the Grecian Bacchus, and

either the Rama of Scripture, or his colony personified, or the Sun, first adored by his idolatrous family.*

Whatever contempt, therefore, the Reviewer might entertain for Mr. Bryant, as an etymologist, where Asiatic radicals are concerned, or for my "illogical mode of reasoning," he ought to have spoken with less disgusting arrogance on a question already determined against him by such high authority in the very way he demands; nor ought such renowned Oriental scholars as Lightfoot, Buxtorf, Walton, Bishop Cumberland, and many other biblical critics, who have adopted the hypothesis of explaining the Scripture names and places adopted by Mr. Bryant, to be treated with such indecent severity.

Observing this marked similiarity between the two systems, and detailed from a source so authentic, the Indian sceptic immediately shifted his ground of attack, and asserted, that Moses *must* have borrowed his accounts of the creation, the deluge, &c. through an Egyptian channel, from the Hindoo books; and they the more strenuously urged this statement, because the President, in his Preface to the Institutes of Hindoo Law, places the highest age of the *Yajur véda* 1580 years before the birth of CHRIST, which, said they, is nine years previous to the birth of MOSES, and ninety before MOSES departed from Egypt with the Israelites. But without entering into the question of that chronology, which is

* Asiatic Researches, Vol. II. p. 401.

merely conjectural, I had previously contended, and still contend, maugre *all* Reviewers, that on the ground of *tradition* the whole of this marked similarity may be fairly accounted for. To suppose indeed that the Hebrew legislator derived his information from the Hindoo books, through the medium of Egyptian records, is the essence of absurdity, because both the fountain (India) and the channel (Egypt) are so deeply contaminated, that some part of the prolonged and multiplied mythology of the one or the other of those nations must have manifested itself in his relation; whereas, nothing can possibly be more concise, or void of embellishment and affectation, than that relation is from the initial to the ultimate verse that describes the events of the infant and regenerated world.

A determination to pursue the same principle upon which I proceeded when I commenced the Ancient History of India, induced me to insert in the Modern History that authentic account of the origin of the Tartar, or Scythian nation, given by their own historian ABULGHAZI BAHADUR, a Tartar prince, to whose authenticity Sir W. Jones bears decisive testimony,* and likely to be better acquainted than any writer of foreign origin with the genuine history of his own nation, in express contradiction to the vaunted pretensions to unfathomable antiquity of that nation, contended for by M. Bailli, in his curious but romantic book on the Origin of the Sciences in Asia. That fascinat-

* See his Dissertation on the Tartars, Asiatic Researches.

ing but pernicious writer labours to prove his favourite Scythians to have been a great, flourishing, and scientific people at that remote period, when, according to his own absurd astronomical chimeras, founded on retrogressive calculations of the motions of the heavenly bodies, "the line of the ecliptic ran through the centre of Asia, and made the frozen region of Siberia fruitful."

In this amazing sketch of astronomical fancy, the system of Mr. Dupuis, who assigns for the origin of the zodiac, by means of the same retrograde computation, the very moderate period of 16,000 years shrinks into perfect insignificance;* but as the views of both writers were equally insidious, and as their avowed object was the downfall of that nobler system which I was bound by duty and honour to uphold, on that very account I eagerly embraced the opportunity of stating from a native Tartar, a king of Charasm, whose rank, power, and education afforded him a decided opportunity of exploring facts, and commanding the best information, the plain, ungarbled, undissembled, fact. That fact is, that the Tartars themselves are utterly ignorant of this their presumed unfathomable antiquity; and in entire consonance with sacred writ, which assigns to Japhet and his posterity this immense portion of the earth, together with the *isles of the Gentiles*, according to that saying, *God shall enlarge Japhet*, Gen. ix. 27; declare themselves descended from that patriarch, by MAGOG, his second son. However romantic,

* M. Dupuis, Origin of the Constellations.

therefore, their fables relative to their renowned progenitors, *Yajuj* and *Majuj*, evidently the same with our *Gog* and *Magog*, whence the term *Mogul* was in all probability derived, as a confirmation of the Mosaic statements from the national annals, I held it a duty to insert the relation of the Tartar historian; for however uninteresting it may be to the avowed partizans of M. Bailli's infidel system, it cannot fail of producing sentiments of exultation and virtuous triumph in the reflecting christian.

"Near the end of the fifth chapter the author relates the fall of the kingdom of Bactria, by the inroads of the Scythians, whom he takes this opportunity of describing; but, in our opinion, with no originality of thought, nor depth of judgement. He draws his information chiefly from Abulghazi Bahadur's geographical history of the Tatârs, and seems to consider the Tatârs, Calmucs, and Mongûls, as three great branches of the same nation. But we are assured by competent authority, that the three Scythian nations of antiquity, the conquerors and founders of so many empires, are the Tatârs, Mongûls, and *Mandshours*, each having a language radically distinct from those of its neighbours, and of the second of which the Calmucs are only a subordinate branch. It would have been greatly preferable to the *uninteresting* fables of Japhet, Yajuj and Majuj, and Irghana Khan, had Mr. Maurice favoured us with a dissertation on those separate tribes, after having studied the three languages above mentioned in the various books which have been composed on the subject.

Repulsive as the labour may seem, it could not be very formidable to an expert philologist, who would find in these volumes of words the only authentic monuments that remain of Scythian history.".

In answer to these malicious insinuations I reply, 1st. That with the mere description of an ancient people "originality of thought" can have but little concern, and the writer's "judgment" is best shewn in a careful selection of the best possible authorities to elucidate their history. Mine are Herodotus, and Abulghazi Khan. Herodotus enters into that description with uncommon minuteness, and his account of their different tribes, together with the relation of their two most celebrated irruptions in ancient times into southern Asia, in which India was widely ravaged, is inserted in pages 109, 110, 111. Their modern threefold division into Tatars, or Tartars properly so called, Calmucks, and Monguls, or Moguls, is inserted on the express authority of the Tartar historian above mentioned. However divided or denominated, they are represented by the united voice of all antiquity as a most barbarous and unlettered race; and the best modern judge in these matters has positively declared "that all their writings extant, even those in the Mogul dialect, are long subsequent to the time of Mahommed; he adds, that the magnificent Gengis, whose empire included an area of near eighty square degrees, could find none of his own Monguls, as the best authors inform us, able to write his dispatches; and Timur,

a savage of strong natural parts, and passionately fond of hearing histories read to him, could himself neither write nor read."*

What admirable sources of sublime information has this ingenious gentleman pointed out to me! *obsolete* languages, of which Europe can boast neither grammar nor dictionary, and Mogul authors that can *neither write nor read.* For my part, I would not engage in the Herculean toil which he recommends, of learning those three savage dialects, to become sovereign of all Tartary; and shall therefore leave to the barbarians of one northern country the luxury of explaining the languages and history of the barbarians of other northern countries. But even if I had not formed this rash resolution of not becoming the sovereign of Tartary at the price of learning its barbarous dialects, I do not see of what peculiar use the knowledge of them would be to me, since Gengis was living at the commencement of the 13th century, when it is confessed the Moguls wrote *no histories*, and my first volume, which he has been mangling with such Scythian barbarity, terminates near the close of the fourteenth century: consequently from the period of his death till the irruption of Timur from the same regions in A. D. 1398, the Tartar "conquerors and founders of so many states and empires" had very little, if any, concern with India. The History of Gengis himself and his posterity is very well compiled from Fadlallah and other Oriental sources, by M. Le Croix, a work, we are informed, of ten

* Sir William Jones in Asiatic Researches, Vol. II. p. 26.

years labour; and the exploits of Timur and Baber, the next ravagers, in order of time, of the Indian territories, are detailed from the sources enumerated in the prefatory chapter of Book II, with sufficient accuracy for every purpose of general history. Against that chapter, indeed, he points his keenest indignation, because it is, as he observes, entirely occupied with an account of the authors principally referred to in the course of the work. He condemns me severely for thus presenting the reader with the history of these authors and their writings in the *body of the work*, and produces it as a "new proof of the scantiness of materials, and the laxity of my judgment in reckoning the history of the books which treat of a country a part of the history of the country itself." p. 298.

This to me *is a new proof*, among innumerable others that I could point out, that the eye of this Reviewer has in general only glanced down the introductory pages that give the heads of the respective chapters, without any perusal of the *body of the work*. The chapter is declared to be *prefatory* in its very first sentence; and my reasons for introducing these authors and their works to the notice of the reader were, that the History being written rather for classical students in general literature, than fastidious Indian critics, to most of those authors and their works they would, of course, be almost entire strangers. The account may be too much extended, but I have been given to understand that this particular chapter has proved

to those for whom it was principally intended in a high degree interesting and gratifying. I beg permission to insert the initial paragraph, for the reader's candid consideration.

"Having in the *preceding book*, brought the Indian history, as far as from very scanty materials, that history could be collected, down to the commencement of the Mohammedan æra; *before we enter on the present very important one*, it will be proper for us to pause for a moment, and consider the sources whence, on so barren a soil, we are to derive the information which it may contain. Although in the introductory chapter to the first book, in which this subject was glanced at, I promised to avail myself of every possible advantage to be obtained from the valuable history of Mahommed Casim Ferishtah in *Persian*, as being the only large work yet given to the public, that at all enters into any details concerning the *domestic* history of India, founded on the basis of native annals; yet as the Arabian historians of the period are not only very numerous, but sometimes circumstantial in relating the series of events that took place in the several quarters of Asia, under the dynasties of the early conquerors of that superstition, I propose invariably to compare that author, and augment and enrich his narration with what they have handed down to us concerning their progress in India, and through the regions nearest to India, in arms and in science."

There occur so many of these purposed misrepresentations that I am almost weary of detecting

them, but there are two or three more which, if passed over wholly unnoticed, might subject me to the imputation of convicted ignorance, and which therefore require at least a transient notice.

I am at a loss to conjecture in what part of my publications the Reviewer discovered that notable confession which he obligingly represents me as making in the following passage, towards the commencement of his critique. "Mr. Maurice disclaims all pretensions to a knowledge of *Sanscreet literature;* a heavy disqualification in a historian of India, for which the greatest abilities will scarcely compensate." p. 291. Weak indeed, and to the last degree presumptuous, must I have been, under such a consciousness of incapacity, to have embarked in so arduous an undertaking as that which has now for some years occupied my pen!

What then have I been about, and upon what have the undiscerning public so long and so absurdly lavished their applause? This is another glaring instance of a knowledge of Sanscreet *grammar* being considered by the Reviewer as the same thing with a knowledge of Sanscreet *literature.* I deny the accusation, and dare him to the proof of his assertion. Had I ever made such a confession, every page of my work on India would have belied it. I have incessantly and diligently cultivated Indian literature through the only authentic channels by which it has hitherto flowed into Europe; and utterly unworthy should I be of the rank I hold in that line of research, and from which his

slanderous insinuations can never degrade me, if I subscribed to his ridiculous doctrine of the *Bhoodists* being a sect superior in point of antiquity to the Brahmins, or conceded to Mr. Bentley's singular positions, however ingeniously supported, relative to the *recent* æra of the Sanscreet astronomy and other sciences. I have read that account, I can assure him, as I have, sedulously, every production of the Society, of which I am an honorary member. I have weighed his arguments in particular, with the profoundest attention; and though by no means inclined, as my writings demonstrate, to credit the Brahminical exaggerations in that science and in chronology, I can by no means conceive so acute and profound an investigator of Sanscreet literature, as Sir W. Jones, to be so far mistaken in his calculations, as to give the date of three thousand years to a system not exceeding, according to Mr. Bentley, a period of between 7 or 800 years.

" Mr. Maurice is not contented with a simple belief in the immediate descent of the Hindoos from the Patriarchs, because their country has been fixed on by the learned for the residence of Noah, Shem, Raamah, &c. after the deluge; but he adds the following most remarkable paragraph:

" Except in the single instance of the pure primeval religion of India, which descended from their patriarchal ancestors, having in some memorable instances degenerated into idolatry, no perceivable vicissitude has taken place among this celebrated people, from the commencement of their empire to the present day. Whatever is true

of them at one period, is equally true of them at another. The laws of the Medes and Persians were not more unalterable. From age to age, from father to son, through a hundred generations, the same uniformity of manners and cast of character prevail; inexterminable by the sword, incorruptible by the vices, and unalterable by the example of their conquerors." p. 5.

It was affirmed *generally;* understood in the general and enlarged sense in which I wrote the passage, it is true, and the best authorities will bear me out in the assertion. Trifling deviations may have taken place among the Hindoos, in regard to certain subordinate points of doctrine, and opinions merely of a civil concern, as for instance their association with *Mileetches*, or infidels, as they term foreigners of all nations, but the prominent, the distinguishing features of the nation in religion, government, and manners, are uniformly the same. The character and the principles of this extraordinary race remain unaltered; and so deeply are they fixed, and as it were interwoven with their very essence, they will probably remain so till the end of time.

The Reviewer proceeds in the same imperious strain, and in the next sentence observes, "Whatever may be the other merits of this account, its historical veracity may certainly be disputed, both on the grounds of the well known mutability of all *ignorant* nations, and of the fact that the Hindoos have *no monuments sufficiently ancient* to support their fabulous pretensions." p. 293.

I must own that I read this passage with a very considerable degree of astonishment, as coming from a writer, who in a preceding page of this invective, when it was convenient to exalt the antiquity of Indian literature, with a view to expose the presumption of a person ignorant of the Sanscreet, in undertaking to write a history of India, expressly affirms that the evidence which India can produce in support of its claims to that antiquity, is far more plausible than that which is advanced by most of the rival empires of Asia. "Its religious doctrines; its mythology and science; its sacred language, nearly forgotten by the very order of men whose interest it is to remember it—necessarily refer us to a period of great antiquity: while its magnificent, but ruined temples, appear to be the work of no superstition *more modern than that of Egypt or Assyria.*" p. 289.

A more glaring contradiction, and in more direct terms in one critique never before, perhaps, insulted the understanding of the literary public, and affords evident testimony that envy and malignity, however ingenious, in the rage of jealous opposition sometimes overshoot their mark, and instead of raising contemptuous sentiments in others, excite nothing but emotions of scorn and indignation against themselves.

Again, he observes, "If, instead of cutting off a few millions of years from the Hindoo chronology to make it more conformable to the Jewish records, the author had examined the oldest treatise

of Hindoo astronomy, or the account recently given of it by Mr. Bentley; or if he had reflected that the superstition of *Boodh* is ten times more general in Asia than that of the *modern Bramins*, who are known to have expelled it from India at a late period, and to have *forged* many books to maintain the antiquity of their own sect; he would probably have changed the assertions made in this paragraph into something more consistent with reason and history. In the present scarcity of facts, it is improper to hazard any positive opinion upon such a subject. But if the Zend, the ancient language of Persia, be radically the same with the Sanscreet, as Sir William Jones has affirmed it to be; and if the Sanscreet, according to the opinion of that illustrious philologist be not the aboriginal language of India, but introduced by some invasion from the north-west, why may it not be supposed that the Medes, about the time they rushed down on the Assyrian empire, took entire possession of the Hindoo peninsula, and carried their language and religion along with them? The Hindoo superstition has a great resemblance to the Magian in its fundamental doctrines." p. 294. By these considerations the Reviewer thinks I ought to have been induced to use language less positive, or at least to have "suspended my judgment in a matter so liable to be controverted." *Ibid.*

I am not to be informed by the Reviewer of the wide diffusion in Asia of the peculiar superstition of Bhood, that superstition which, in the 6th

volume of Indian Antiquities, so far back as the year 1796, I had extensively traced through Asia, as well as Europe, even to the British isles, of which circumstance he seems to affect an entire ignorance, as if those Antiquities had been published in an obscure corner of the kingdom, and had been honoured by no readers of Oriental celebrity, and erudition. He will also find under the history of the 9th Indian Avatar, inserted in the 2d volume of my Ancient India, and published in 1798, a very ample account of nearly all that has been written by Indian scholars concerning this celebrated deity of Asia;* but his disciples are constantly and *justly*, if there be any truth in the statements of Sir William Jones, represented, as a sect far inferior in antiquity to that of the Brahmins. I consider every assertion to the contrary as a direct insult to the memory of the translator of the "*Institutes of Menu*, SON OF BRAHMA," whose laws they avowedly are, and to whose promulgation Sir William assigns the æra of 1280 years before Christ. Would so great a judge of what was genuine and what was fabulous in the history and antiquities of Asiatic kingdoms have expended so much time, as a translation of that

* See Ancient History of Hindostan, Vol. II. p. 480, where not only Sir W. Jones's opinions, but those of Mr. Wilkins, Captain Wilford, Mr. Chambers, and other Sanscreet scholars, with the result, are given at length on this disputed topic, edit. 1798. "*Had I reflected that the superstition of Bhood," &c.* I own I cannot but smile at the real or affected ignorance of this writer! Had he but *reflected*, he surely never would have penned this unfounded, malignant, incoherent rhapsody!

code must have required, if he had thought the Brahmins to be only *secondary* in rank and in power in India? or so anxiously have engaged in an elaborate Digest of *Hindu* and Mahommedan Law, had any other power reigned on the banks of the Ganges, so late as a century or two only before Christ? With all due respect to the idols of Buddha at Gaya, the figures of Sommonacodom in Deccan, and the print of Buddha's foot in Ceylon;—what language speak the stupendous caverns of Jarasandha or Elephanta, of Salsette, of Canara, of Ellora—to what system but the Brahminical does the carved imagery in those rock temples refer? Do not the incarnations of Veeshnu, the rites and symbol of Seeva, the exploits of Ram and Hanuman appear most prominent amidst their endless and diversified sculptures. None but a mighty sovereign, reigning in peace, and in the plenitude of undisturbed power over a patient and superstitious people, could have fabricated those immense labours; consequently we are led to suppose that they were formed long previous to Greek and Mahommedan irruptions. What says the page of Herodotus, who flourished 400 years before Christ, concerning the Indians? Is not his account of the Hindoos, their division into tribes, their vegetable diet, their manufactures of cotton, and their horror at shedding blood, so applicable to them at this day, demonstrative of a race not given to change, and even less mutable, in their laws and religion, than the Medes and Persians? What was the prevailing religion in

India, as detailed to us by Strabo, and the correct Arrian at the period of Alexander's invasion 320 years before Christ; and of the visit of Megasthenes to Palibothra 40 years afterwards? Do not these authors speak of the same division of the Hindoos into casts; their residence under the shade of great trees, or in holy caves; their universal belief in the metempsychosis; their adoration of the solar orb and elemental fire; their unceasing ablutions in tanks and sacred rivers; their custom of staining their foreheads with sandal wood of different colours, according to the diversity of their cast; their severe and excruciating penances; and lastly, their burning of the dead, practised at this day by the higher Brahmin classes, in the very same manner as it was performed by Zarmanochagus, at Athens, before the whole assembled army of Alexander? Compare these accounts of the ancient with the authentic living picture of Indian habits and doctrines exhibited in the SACONTALA of Calidas, a drama actually represented at the court of Vicramaditya, who reigned over Hindostan in the first century before Christ, and observe how minutely accurate the resemblance! In the oldest historian and geographers of classical antiquity, I mean Herodotus, Ptolemy, and Strabo, the names of celebrated cities and places, throughout Hindostan, are for the most part pure Sanscreet, with Greek terminations, as *Baliputra*, the city of Bali, or Palibothra; *Methora*, Mathura; *Agara*, Agra; *Nagara*, Nagur; *Jomanes*, the river Jumna; *Chaberis*, the river Cavery; *Patala*, Patna; *Ozene*,

Ougein; *Arcati Regia*, Arcot; and, with the licence sometimes used by the Greeks, *Gogra*, Agoramis; *Renas*, Aornus; *Outch*, Oxydracæ. These names occurring in the oldest Sanscreet books of geography and history, and many of them allusive to Indian mythology, so decisively mark the superior antiquity of the Brahmin system to any other, that one is astonished at the ignorance or temerity of the man who ventures to assert the contrary.

As I had extensively discussed the superstition of the Indian Bhood, in the 6th volume of Indian Antiquities, so, at a period very long preceding, I had investigated that still more curious subject of the striking resemblance subsisting between the Hindoo and Magian rites of worship. It constitutes indeed the principal portion of the second volume of that work, which was published in 1791, when the Sanscreet mine was very little explored, and before the arrival in England of that particular volume of the Asiatic Researches which contains the Dissertation on the ancient Persians; consequently it was the entire result of my own industrious researches into Hyde on the Persian religion, and those other Oriental authors, of which I submitted to the public in my first volume an ample catalogue, and a comparison of what was contained in them, with the doctrines in the Geeta, Sacontala, and the few genuine Sanscreet documents then before the public. Those who do not consider the remote period of my first publication on Indian subjects, when nearly every thing was conjecture, deny me that essential

justice, to which my investigations have a fair claim. Fifteen years have since elapsed, and we are now far advanced in Sanscreet lore; yet have envy and inveterate malignity never been able to discover in my pages any gross or wilful mis-statement; nor any errors but what the candid critic will readily excuse in that comparative infancy of our knowledge of India. My hypotheses, as they are termed, may excite the smile of the sceptical and superficial reader, but they who with unprejudiced minds and deliberate attention, peruse the contents of my volumes, and properly weigh the evidence adduced in them, will at least find matter for serious reflection. If a Geddes, and a Scotch junto disapprove, I can boast a Pretyman, a Horsley, and a Burgess, to commend.

In that volume, although I had clearly pointed out the similitude between the rites practised in the Indian cavern temples, and those celebrated in the caves of Mithra, in the Median mountains, where, according to Porphyry, Zoroaster first consecrated a cavern to the solar deity,* yet I by no means attempted from that circumstance to draw the inference deduced by the Reviewer; viz. that the similarity in question arose from any previous conquest of Hindostan by the Medes, a thing unrecorded in history, and utterly repugnant to probability, but to the sages of both nations having been educated in the same grand school of Chaldea, whence they carried the solar and sidereal supersti-

* See his very curious Treatise *de Antro Nympharum*, p. 256. edit. Cantab. 1655.

tion, together with the veneration paid to elemental fire, to the remotest quarters, of the world! I contended, also, for a *primæval language*, which will account for two nations so near to each other, having a great many words radically alike,—a *language* with which that of all the nations of the earth had a remote connection; for, though I know such an opinion has been greatly controverted, it is positively asserted in Scripture that before the *labial* confusion of utterance, (such alone with Mr. Bryant,* I conceive it to have been,) took place at Babel, *all the earth was of one language*, or as it stands more distinctly related in the original; *Erat terra labii unius, et sermonis ejusdem; the whole earth was of one lip, and of one speech.* Gen. xi. 1, 2. The argument of the Reviewer, however, tends directly to subvert the statement of Sir William Jones, who in the dissertation alluded to, instead of introducing to us a race of Median conquerors sitting on the throne of India, exhibits to us a race of Hindoo Monarchs, of the Mahabadian dynasty, before the accession of CAYUMERS, exalted on the throne of Iran,† whence probably they migrated to this more genial and secluded region of Asia; and we may be certain, that by these sovereigns were not intended those who professed the religious creed of Buddha, but those of the Brahmin ritual, because MAHBUL, or MAHA BELI, the same personage as recorded in the 5th

* Consult Bryant's Analysis, Vol. III. p. 31.

† See Asiatic Researches, Vol. II. p. 64.

Indian Avatar of the Brahmin mythology, is expressly mentioned as one of them, " who had raised the empire to the zenith of human glory."*

I shall now leave it to the unbiassed judgment of the reader, to which the Reviewer is on all occasions fond of appealing, whether HE with his Persian and Arabic auxiliaries, or I without that aid, have more diligently considered, or more truly represented, the abstruse subjects in question. It rests with him also to explain, for nobody else can, the reason of his denominating the Brahmins *modern*, when a little before he had assigned to their monuments the antiquity of the Pyramids of Egypt, and the tower of Belus; as well as of his applying to them that remarkable expression " the mutability of *ignorant* nations" in the face of their eminent superiority above all Eastern nations in arts and sciences, demonstrated by the President in his Dissertation on the Literature of the Hindoos; while the impartial public will ultimately decide, whether I am constantly wasting my own and the reader's time, on any " *obscure topic* relating to the country," and whether I ought to have suspended my judgment in matters so liable, *he thinks*, to be controverted, as whether the Bhoodists were a sect superior in antiquity to the Brahmins, or the Medes the ancient possessors of the throne of India!!!

Towards the conclusion of this tedious effort of malignant criticism I read, still farther to my astonishment, the following passage:

* Asiatic Researches, Vol. II. p. 48.

" Mr. Maurice pursues his route, along with Mahmud of Gazna, through seas of blood, and over mountains of slain. The invasions of this conqueror were made in the spirit of the Korân and its first disciples, into a country rich beyond description, and entirely exposed to destruction. Our historian describes these successive inroads in his usual manner; that is, with great inequality of style, sometimes *inflated*, and at other times *insufferably mean*. He undertakes, in this place, to give the geography of Multan, Tatta, Lahore, Gaur, and other districts conquered by the Mahometans. Instead of doing this in a clear and appropriate manner, he loads the description with many extraneous and undignified circumstances, more resembling a statistical account than an historical sketch. In short, he copies the Ayeen Akbery, word for word. Of one of these districts he gives us, among other things, the following information:—

' In Tattah are various fine fruits, and the mangoes are remarkably good. A small kind of melon grows wild. Here are also a great variety of flowers; and their camels are much esteemed.' p. 293.

The style of every history must ever in a great degree vary with the subject under consideration. Geographical descriptions of a country, whose internal regions are, even yet, so little known to us as India, are absolutely necessary to an European reader; and it will be allowed, I presume, that the exploits of an hero ought to be

narrated in a different language from that which describes the boundaries of a province, or enumerates its productions. In the Ayeen Akbery are found the most authentic native accounts of the provinces that could be referred to, and in consequence considerable use was made of that work: could a better be pointed out by the Reviewer? The contrast in point of style may be striking; but that circumstance was the natural result of a history, in the progress of which almost every thing was to be explained, and a variety of authors to be cited. Notwithstanding a few less laboured passages, I trust that, in general, the style of the Indian History, at least whatever portions of it were *really* composed by myself, is neither offensively tumid, nor deficient in elegance and spirit. If from my pen was ever expected a history written in the frigid style and manner of this Reviewer, I rejoice that expectation has been disappointed. In my humble conception, to an *Oriental*, but especially to an Indian History, composed as that history *ought* to be, and confined to those important events alone worthy to be recorded, a style more than usually elevated seems of right to belong, since objects more than usually grand, and interesting, are constantly passing in review before the astonished reader: The word *Facundia*, so liberally bestowed upon my style, by the Monthly Reviewer, even when cavilling at my book, is in *his* vocabulary, that seems to have been written with a pen steeped in the waters of Acheron, translated *inflation*. Be it so; but I defy him to prove

that any sentence composed by the correspondent, in early life, of Johnson, of Burke, and of Jones, ever deserved the epithet of *insufferably mean*. Literal translations indeed, occasionally necessary to illustrate obscure and intricate points in history and geography, from certain scarce and curious tracts and books, as Renaudot's Relations Anciennes, the Golden Meadows of Massoudi, Mr. Wilford's Essays, and the abovementioned Ayeen Akbery, have sometimes found their way into my text; but for any inaccuracies contained in the passages thus cited, their authors are alone answerable. I purposely gave them in their *own words*, that they might be so, and this practice may have occasioned in my page, as I confess in some instances it has, an apparent inequality. The true apology is that submitted to the reader in the preceding page, viz. that mine must be considered as only a first essay towards a General History of India, exhibiting rather a comprehensive outline, than aspiring to the character of a perfect history; and consequently a generous critic would rather have thanked me for bringing together from every possible quarter these collateral aids, than rudely have condemned it to utter oblivion, because destitute of that Attic order and elegance with which, at some distant period, but certainly not at present, the task may be executed. I was compelled also to give the extracts at considerable length, as many of the volumes cited were rare and costly, and the general body of my subscribers being rather *classical* than *Indian* scholars, most probably did

not possess the books in question. In fact, the Reviewer knew that the kind of finished Ciceronian history demanded by him, was at present not practicable, and therefore it was that he so arrogantly demanded it.

I candidly own, however, that had I adhered to the plan originally formed in my own mind, of giving only the history of the successive Invasions of India, and the lives and history of the Invaders of that distinguished region, the plan would have better suited my disposition and genius; the possibility of these paltry cavils of the critic tribe would have been prevented; and a more solid and lasting glory would eventually have been obtained. I confess that I degraded myself, when, deviating from that grand original plan, I condescended to become the historian of the petty warfare of contending Omrahs and Rajahs, and to detail the intrigues and murders of perfidious Viziers. As I advanced, however, down the current of Indian History, I found that these details constituted almost the sum and substance of it, as indeed they do of nearly all Eastern history whatever, when particulars are entered into. Had I declined the inglorious task of being their historian, a far more formidable blank, in its wonderful annals, than any alluded to by the Reviewer, must inevitably have taken place; for in its internal history, so far as it is known to us, (and we know enough of it to excite in us the utmost tædium and disgust,) little else occurs for whole centuries during the dark period of the middle ages, when the Gauride and

CHILLIGI sovereigns swayed its imperial sceptre. In fact, the name of INDIA imposes upon us. Dazzled by the accounts handed down to us by the historians of Alexander, of Mahmud, of Gengis, of Timur, we expect something vast and magnificent in *every* page; whereas it is in the accounts of *their* exploits and conquests *only* that the wonderous tale is verified.

I am perfectly aware, and sensibly *feel*, what an Historian of India, upon the great and comprehensive scale, *should be*, and what he should *feel;* but my hands were manacled, and my genius cramped by the nature of the subject. With unfettered hands, and with a nobler subject, I scruple not to affirm that I could have produced a work that should have defied the utmost malice of malignant criticism; for, it is not the business of an historian of this higher order to enter at all into the minutiæ of detail. His province is to pourtray with a bold hand and an animated pencil, the grand events and leading causes that bring about the rise and decline of empires; to hold up to the admiration of ages the great and virtuous, and to devote to eternal infamy the base and the sanguinary characters, respectively concerned in the revolutions he describes. He seizes the great features of the times, and dwells only on predominant facts and personages. Embarked on the Ganges, he disdains to deviate with its diverging branches, but steadily pursues his tract along the central wave of the mighty current to which his vessel is committed.

Ambitious to rank in this class of historians, and in this only, I had already offered to the public the apology that follows in the neglected preface of this very work! "It has been well observed by a writer who preceded me in this line of historical investigation, (Professor Ockley,) that the course of a great history should resemble the current of a vast river, with difficulty restrained within its bounds, and sometimes even overflowing its banks; sometimes rushing forward with a great and impetuous descent, and at others gliding on with an equal and almost imperceptible motion. From natural impulse, not less than conviction, I am led heartily to accede to this decision of Ockley, and am resolved to adhere, in the present, as in the former work, to that more dignified style of narration, which alone becomes the majesty of history. After having made choice of a period fraught with sublime and interesting events, the true historian descends not to trivial incidents, but seizing the striking facts and prominent characters of the times, consigns them to immortality on the faithful tablet of her recording page. It is, above all things, incumbent upon him properly to *feel* the various subjects which his pen describes—when the trumpets are sounded, he must glow with his hero, and transport his reader with himself, amidst the thickest of the battle. But while he gives to valour its due tribute of applause, he should never forget (and I trust in these pages it has not been forgotten,) to expose in terms of just and warm indignation, the sanguinary principles that too

frequently accompany the warrior to the field of Asiatic conflict; the ferocity of Mohammedan zeal, and the ravages of Tartar barbarity." Preface, p. 9.

To act in as strict conformity as possible with this rule, though compelled in some instances to deviate from it, in order to avoid leaving a vast hiatus in the narration, I have devoted my principal attention to delineate those events most conspicuous on the theatre of Indian History. Alexander, and his Greek successors on the Bactrian throne, Mahmud, Gengis, Timur, Baber, Akber, have already appeared on that theatre; their characters, I trust, delineated in glowing colours, and their heroic feats correctly detailed from the best authorities to which I could gain access, and for every purpose of General History, they are, I say not *sufficient* only, but *abundant*. Let not my merits, as an historian, be judged by those portions of this work in which materials almost totally failed, and I was compelled to the painful drudgery of abridging the dull pages of Ferishta; but by what has been done when subjects worthy of a pen not in general addicted to tame and frigid narration has presented itself; when events and characters have arisen for investigation, sufficiently important to call forth those energies which possibly, owing to neglect in certain Indian quarters, where patronage was most to be expected, but poisoned by predominant Caledonian influence, added to increasing disgust inspired by the subject, were, I frankly own, not always exerted as they

ought to have been. Aurengzebe, Nadir Shah, Abdallah, and their sanguinary exploits, yet remain to be described, and as authorities are now become at once more numerous and less suspicious, their portraits, I trust, will not disgrace the pencil that draws them. So much for the imputed *inequality* of my style, which, however elevated, never rises without a proper subject to justify that elevation; and is never depressed, except when I am quoting such cold and spiritless writers as the Edinburgh Reviewer!

Having thus displayed, at considerable length, the more prominent calumnies and glaring misrepresentations of this pseudo-critic. I shall not descend to notice and expose the minuter efforts of his malignity, though every page of his critique produces instances of captious censure, sufficiently irritating, and palpably unjust. There is only one passage more, which my reverence and respect for Dr. Vincent induce me to notice, as I am accused of borrowing the opinions of that learned writer, on the subject of the ancient and modern geography of Ceylon, and of substituting his decisions for my own. The passage is as follows:

"Much of this chapter" (the sixth) "is employed in reconciling the ancient and modern geography of India, and particularly of Ceylon. As the author can make no progress in this department by *his own learning*, he rests implicitly on the strength of the writers in the Asiatic Researches, or the *opinions* of Dr. Vincent." He adds, "It is in this unfortunate chapter that the weakness of

European knowledge concerning India appears in the most humiliating form. It is here, likewise, that the *judgment* of Mr. Maurice, in undertaking to write on a subject on which *he had no information*, stands most heavily impeached before the public." p. 298.

My description of Ceylon, in the chapter alluded to, that island, so important in Indian History, from its having been the scene of the exploits of RAM and RAVAN, so extensively detailed by me under the 7th Avatar, is founded on the information given us by Diodorus Siculus, by Ptolemy, and Pliny, compared with what we find in Knox's History of the island, the only correct one at that time before the public, and some very cursory notices (the island not being then in our possession, and only very partially explored) relative to it in the Asiatic Researches. This, in fact, has *uniformly* been my practice, when geographically describing the celebrated cities and places of India; classical authors, if any of them have noticed the object in question, having been in the first place consulted; in the second, their accounts have been compared and contrasted with those of later travellers and writers, and as I know of none more authentic than those in the Asiatic Researches, they were naturally and frequently referred to; but I deny that *implicit reliance* was placed on any of them. Dr. Vincent, who had recently travelled over the same ground, was only collaterally referred to, as affording confirmation, and sanction of *my opinions*, and *conclusion*. The

same channels of enquiry, the same sources of information, were open to myself and to Dr. Vincent; and neither of us professes to be in the least conversant with the languages of Asia. Is an uniformity of sentiment, upon any particular subject to be branded with the base idea of plagiarism? I am under no difficulty, however, on other occasions of confessing myself under important obligations for very considerable information reflected from the pages of that learned and elaborate work, with respect to the southern regions of India, and those obligations have been repeatedly acknowledged by me in that explicit manner which ought to have prevented any ill natured allusion of this sort.* None but a superficial Scotch cynic would have made it.

And have I indeed ventured upon this wide and perilous Indian Ocean, in a bark that has no botttom? Have I attempted to compose the history of an important empire of Asia without proper investigation, with *no information* on the subject? It may be convenient to represent me in that light in order to crush the sale of my book, for purposes best known to the Reviewer, and his *Scythian clan;* but the more generous public who have now for a series of years read and applauded

* See Modern History of Hindostan, from p. 130 to p. 137, which describes Ceylon, its inhabitants, and their customs and manners, with correct references to each classical author consulted. Dr. Vincent's Nearchus is only once referred to throughout the whole description, and that upon a subject of no very great moment in the investigation, the *cinnamon* neglected to be mentioned by Iambulus in his account of the island.

my Indian lucubrations, know the falsehood of the assertion, and if report relative to this malicious critique accurately informs me, scout with derision the insidious calumniator!

If the task I have set myself be unusually bold and arduous, allowances, proportionably candid ought to be made for the effort, or at least the harshness of invective might have been spared; especially when it is considered that without a knowledge of Persian, Arabic, or Sanscreet, I have done more than all that multifarious JUNTO in whom these eminent advantages are united. If my deficiency in those languages be censurable, still I trust that, where it has been possible, I have anxiously endeavoured to fulfil the duty of an historian in all those great points which the laws of history require; but, particularly, in that most important of all, the MORAL resulting from an historical survey of the characters most celebrated on the theatre of Asiatic warfare. In the boundless and destructive ambition of those Eastern potentates, I have been assiduous to display the *causes* of those mighty revolutions which are described in the course of it; in their pride and arrogance, the *downfall* of their empires; and in their crimes, the *extinction* of the glory of their respective sovereignties. If, instead of that mutilated fragment cited in page 299 of this acrimonious Review, he had condescended to insert the whole of Mahmud's character, and the subsequent reflections that conclude the chapter, he might have spared the sarcastic sneer at the manner in which the

"Historian of Hindostan delineates characters." I shall venture, as it is but short, to present the passage unmutilated to the reader, and shall not fear its comparison with any passage in the most finished page of his vaunted ROBERTSON, or HUME, with whose merits as well as with whose defects, as historians, I am as perfectly acquainted as their vain and devoted countryman.

"Thus great, thus mean; thus formidable, thus contemptible; thus benevolent, thus cruel, was the potent Mahmud; whose empire extended from the shores of the Caspian to the mouth of the Indus; and from the Tigris to the Ganges. No Mohammedan prince before him ever attained to so exalted a point of power and splendour, ever rolled in so much wealth, or was ever contaminated with so much blood. The liberal patron of the arts, at Gazna; at Delhi, the remorseless despoiler of their proudest monuments; affecting towards the Great Creator the most zealous piety, but acting towards his creatures with ferocious barbarity. So singular a compound of qualities the most opposite, has seldom occurred in the historic page; though, in *these* pages, but too many characters will hereafter pass in review, polluted with all the vices, unmitigated by the virtues of Mahmud. Of the atrocities that marked a GENGIS, a TIMUR, and an AURENGZEB, it will soon be my painful task to give the black details, and to trace through desolated India, their blood-stained steps. I shall attempt neither to disguise, nor to palliate their crimes; but display them,

for the contemplation of future depredators, in all the horrors of native deformity; under whatever sounding title concealed, endeavour to detect and expose the sordid baseness of avarice, and to ensanguined ambition hold up the genuine mirror. This is the duty of the historian at all times, but more particularly, of an historian of India; the *debateable ground*, if I may so term it, of ravaged Asia—the ACELDAMA of the earth." p. 304.

In turning over the pages of my volume I must again request of the reader ever to bear in mind the *comparative infancy* of our knowledge in regard to India; I allude principally to its internal history and domestic annals; for unto its ancient arts and sciences a wide field of enquiry has been long open, and that, however grossly misrepresented by the Reviewer, I never professed to present the public with any other than a connected History of that country, *as far as the researches of ancient classical writers and modern discovery have made it known to us.* Every body knows that the thread of connexion in many periods of that history must be extremely slender; but that is not the fault of the historian. I have made the best use possible of such materials, as, with very extensive research, I could collect together, and of every person connected with India, I challenge the thanks, and am entitled to the applause. Nor are those materials, after all this idle gasconade about Eastern languages and science, either few in number, or deficient in point of importance and authenticity. They are not, indeed, SANSCREET *authorities*, but who is

there, except Mr. Wilkins in Europe, and two or three Asiatic students, that know any thing of Sanscreet, at least sufficiently so to present the public with a history of India from native sources. In this great dearth of Indian knowledge I had flattered myself, that the names of authors of such universal and deserved celebrity in the path of Asiatic history, as ABULFEDA, whose esteemed Moslem Annals have been given us in an elegant translation, by the learned Reiske, in five quarto volumes, and which, with ELMACIN's Saracenic History, translated by Erpenius, are cited in almost every page, posterior to the commencement of the Hejira, to correct or confirm the statements in Ferishta,—of which I deeply regret we have no more accurate translation, and shall be very much obliged to these learned Persic scholars, when they are pleased to indulge us with a better.—MIRKHOND, the Persian historian, an authentic translation of whose valuable work has been lately published at Vienna, under the title of "Historia Regum Persarum post firmatum in Regno Islamismum," bringing that history down to the year of Christ 1150.—This, with Stephen's General History of that country from the *same* Mirkhond, was amply sufficient for my purpose of detailing the events that befel the Persian empire, in the early annals of the Hejira; which events, as well as the conquests of the Arabians recorded by Abulfeda, and Professor OCKLEY, in his History of the Saracens, though deemed irrelevant by the Reviewer, were

absolutely necessary to be narrated on account of their influence on the affairs of India, afterwards successively conquered by these Arab and Persian invaders of the higher Asia:—Ebn Abdollatif, Author of the Lebtarikh, translated into Latin, and published in Thevenot.—Ulug Beg, whose Epochæ Celebriores of the great Asiatic Empires, were so highly important for the elucidation of their intricate Chronology. Of Abulfaragius, author of the History of the Arabian Dynasties, with Pocock's Supplement to those dynasties.—Of Abulghazi Bahadur, whose History of the Tartars, is the only authentic one on record.—The History of Gengis Khan, compiled from Fadlallah, Abulcair, and other Oriental writers, by M. De Le Croix, the elder.—Sheriffeddin and Arabshah's History of Timur Bec, with Professor White's Institutes of that renowned chieftain.—Ebn Haukal's Oriental Geography given us by Ouseley.—Al Edrisi, the Nubian Geographer.—Anciennes Relations of Renaudot.—Travels in India, of Marco Paulo.—The Ayeen Akbery, Asiatic Researches, Maffæi Historia Indica, De Laet's India Vera,—Gladwin's Translation from Persian MSS. of the Reigns of Jehanguire, Shah Jehaun, and Aurengzebe.—Scott's History of Dekkan from Ferishta—the translated work of Golam Hossain, the geographical works of Rennel, together with all those writers and travellers enumerated in a former page as illustrative of the events of the two last centuries---I had, I say, flattered myself

that the very considerable catalogue of authors cited or referred to in almost every page of the history, procured by me for the purpose, and most of them with extreme difficulty and at an enormous expense, would have sheltered me from the charge of inadequacy on the score of materials, at least for what I *bona fide* undertook to perform, and have disarmed the fury of the most ferocious of the critic tribe.

Hard as the rocks, and obdurate as the storms of his native region, the Edinburgh Reviewer looks down with disdain on this accumulation of authorities, for an Indian History of the kind I alone proposed, and has the effrontery to tell the public that "my narratives are drawn from the most common sources," page 291. Are the Asiatic Researches then, and particularly the Dissertations, in that work, of Sir W. Jones, the Ayeen Akbery, Gladwin's Lives of the three Emperors above mentioned, Scott's Dekkan, from Ferishta, and Golam Hossain, in whose pages is contained so ample a portion of the genuine history of modern India; are these such contemptible sources of *information?* Let him abuse, if he please, my deficient taste in composition, want of judgment, want of scientific arrangement, but let him not deny me the merit of industry in getting together all the materials possible, in this, I repeat the words, *comparative infancy of our knowledge of India*, to complete the plan which I had formed for myself, not the plan which he is so obliging to mark out for me, and beyond which my boldest ambition never ventured to aspire.

In a part of the volume having occasion to mention the name of Mr. Gibbon, my more immediate præcursor in the field of Asiatic history, who, by the way it may be remarked, knew no more of Asiatic languages than myself, though in the latter portion of his work, extensively engaged in the details of Arabian and Persian history—but was this ignorance of the dialects of Asia ever seriously objected to Mr. Gibbon, who could only become acquainted with the history of those nations by means of ABULFARAGIUS, ELMACIN, and the other Oriental authors cited above;—having however occasion to mention that respectable name, the Reviewer cannot let slip the tempting opportunity of throwing out a sarcastic sneer at what he is pleased to term my *naiveté*, as if I meant to parallel our historical merits. In answer to this suggestion I can only say that, whatever *ingenuity* I may possess in drawing parallels, when I stated "that Mr. Gibbon sometimes traversed nearly the same historical ground with myself, but that properly it was rather *my* ground than *his*," I merely stated a simple fact, in justification of my occupation of that ground. I neither meant presumptuously to compare myself with that splendid writer, nor will I meanly shrink from a comparison with *any* writer, however exalted, when subjects of adequate importance may call forth the full exertion of intellect and talent! The subject alluded to, as engaging our mutual pens, was the *mighty*, the *triumphant Gengis*; and though it may appear like

insufferable vanity in an author to exhibit any portion of his own composition as a sample of the rest; yet as the Edinburgh Reviewer has obligingly omitted to give any extract except a few mutilated passages, with a view wholly to crush the work; and as the Monthly Reviewer, who, from his *mode* of criticising the Modern History of India, cannot be supposed to be very partial to it, has selected this very passage as a specimen of the historical style, I shall request the reader's permission to insert it, together with his concluding decision, and leave both that and the present Vindication for the cool consideration of a generous and impartial ENGLISH PUBLIC.

"The conflict," says the Reviewer, "hardly paralleled, even in the bloody annals of Asiatic warfare, between the terrible GENGIS and MOHAMMED, the Charazmian sovereign, with its *causes* and the *results*, are such as must particularly fix the attention of the reader; and they are so singular that we are induced to add the passages in which they are detailed, although this article is already too much lengthened."

"GENGIS KHAN'S INVASION OF SOUTHERN ASIA.

"Triumphant on every field where his banners had hitherto been displayed, the Asiatic writers represent to us the Emperor of the Moguls as content with his large acquired moiety of divided Asia,

as anxious to cultivate friendship and commerce with the Charazmian monarch; as sending successive ambassadors to announce these friendly sentiments, and confirming them by ample presents of the richest productions of his country. The stern, suspicious, unaccommodating nature of the Sultan, led him to consider those presents as snares, and those ambassadors as spies. His haughty soul brooked not a rival, especially an infidel rival; and secretly meditated that dreadful blow which, though it convulsed Asia, and plunged myriads of human beings into the abyss of eternity, he seemed to think deserving of the great Mohammed, in the full career and confidence of victory, to strike. The species of insult which he offered to Gengis was of a nature never to be forgotten or forgiven. In every age, and among the most barbarous people, the character of an *ambassador*, the image of the sovereign, has ever been held sacred. The arrestation and murder, by his order, of three ambassadors and a caravan of peaceable merchants at Otrar, instantly became the bloody signal of a war interminable, unextinguishable, but by the death of one or of the other of the royal champions. Called upon by fresh ambassadors, dispatched by the policy of Gengis to demand an explanation of the fact, the sultan returned no other answer than a repetition of the daring crime; and the heads of three other noble Moguls, severed by the sabres of his attendants, while delivering their master's commands, stained with blood the foot of the throne of the perfidious tyrant. Gengis,

on receiving this intelligence, in the fury and anguish of his heart, is said to have separated himself for three days and three nights, from his family, and during that space, to have devoutly supplicated the assistance of heaven against a monster black with so many crimes. It is added, but by a Christian historian, (Abulfarajius,) that on the third night, a person in the habit of a Christian monk appeared to him in a dream, and encouraged him to fear not, but instantly lead his troops to battle; a relation justly rejected by his more modern biographer, as unworthy a Christian monk, and the God of Christianity. The spirit that incited Gengis to arms was the dæmon Ambition, and the vision which he beheld was the vast and beautiful landscape of southern Asia, full of noble cities, abundantly stored with the costly articles of luxurious commerce reciprocal among various and distant nations, that had grown rich under the protection of the more peaceable sultans of the Gaznavide and Seljuk dynasties. Though plunder and aggrandizement were the real, the primary object of Gengis; yet the murder of his ambassadors was a theme on which he neglected not to expatiate in terms of the warmest and bitterest invective; imparting in a bold and manly strain of eloquence, the fire and vengeance that glowed in his own bosom, to those of his sons and courtiers. The battalions of his immense army were instantly put in motion; the arms of the common men were the sabre, the bow, the quiver full of arrows, and the battle-axe. All

the officers of his army were clothed in complete suits of mail, and their horses also wore breast plates of iron, and other defensive armour impenetrable by the arrows of the enemy. The positive order of Gengis was, that every man should fight in his station till he conquered or fell; the flight of individuals or of single squadrons, was to be punished with instant death, by their nearest comrades. By a singular law of the military code of Gengis, it was ordained, that if *ten* commanders at the head of their combined squadrons, the whole army being divided into bodies regulated by that number, should think it necessary to *retreat*, they were at liberty to do so; but smaller parties, by a retrograde movement, rushed only on inevitable destruction. In this manner disciplined and armed, the soldiers of Gengis, under the command of himself and his four valiant sons, marched forth to battle, and on a review previous to the engagement, were found to consist of no less than seven hundred thousand men; MEN, says the historian, of an athletic make, of high-braced vigorous sinews, impatient for action, breathing nothing but war and blood; yet though fiery, perfectly obedient to their prince: MEN, who, unlike the dainty Moslems, could banquet on any kind of food, wolves, bears, and dogs; MEN able to brave the rigours of every climate, and soundly slumber on a bed of flint.

"Mohammed, without terror, heard from his scouts the details of their number and ferocity. He considered these savage hordes as utterly

destitute of all true military science, and as unable to stand before the veteran conquerors of Persia, who had triumphed over the bravest nations of Asia, and who themselves amounted to four hundred thousand fighting men, being the flower of the warlike legions dispersed over the domains of this mighty prince in Iran, Transoxiana, Chorasan, and all the vast frontier of Western India. The terrible concussion of two such immense armies can be better conceived than described. It took place, according to Le Croix, at Karaku, near Otrar, north of the river Jaxartes, in A. H. 615, or A.D. 1218, a memorable epoch in Eastern annals, being the date of the first grand irruption of the Moguls and Tartars into Southern Asia; and with such intense fury did the battle last, that the darkness of the night alone separated the contending armies. The ensuing morn discovered a sight horrible to humanity; one hundred and sixty thousand Charazmians, and a still more numerous body of Moguls, weltering in an ocean of human blood. A dreadful pause ensued; the Charazmian army retired within its lines, where for some days it remained strongly intrenched, to avoid the hazard of surprise from the Moguls, and at length a retreat before so potent and still numerous an enemy was resolved upon, and effected. All the considerable cities and strong holds of Charazm and Transoxiana were powerfully reinforced with fresh troops; and the Sultan hoped to retard, at least, if not to weary out, the Mogul emperor, by the length of tedious sieges, and the desultory

harassing attacks of a large flying army of horse, of one part of which he took himself the command, and gave the other to his brave son, Gelaleddin, who had gloriously distinguished himself during the late severe engagement. But Gengis had four sons, lions in courage like himself, and these were placed at the head of armies vast in numbers, and ever supplied with fresh recruits from the still overflowing tribes of the north. Opposition from a routed and dispirited army was utterly fruitless. Otrar, though it had been recently strengthened with a body of no less than sixty thousand troops, after a desperate resistance of five months, fell beneath the vigorous assaults of his sons OCTAI and ZAGATHAI. The subjugation of the other great cities lying on or near the Jaxartes, particularly the celebrated and well fortified city of Cogende, situated in about the latitude of 41° 25′, was committed to his eldest son TUSHI; and it must be owned, that if the besiegers shewed invincible courage in assailing, the besieged, in every instance, resisted with an ardour and an obstinacy that evinced equal loyalty to their prince, and love of their country. But the due reward of unsuccessful valour was not allotted to the unfortunate Charazmians by the ungenerous Moguls. After being despoiled of their property, they were generally led forth to be butchered in cold blood, without distinction of either age or sex, by their savage conquerors, who, under the pretext of avenging the outrage and murder at Otrar, seemed to delight in shedding torrents of

Mohammedan blood: unconscious of pity, and callous to all remorse."

"The exploits of the brave Gelaleddin are recorded in a manner worthy of the subject: indeed the narrative shews to great advantage the talents of Mr. Maurice, and proves that he wants nothing from Nature to intitle him to class in the first rank of historians."

"In relating the end of Gengis, the author accompanies it with a very striking observation:"

"After recovering Tangut by his arms, and awing China to peace by the terror of his frown, this great, this politic, but stern and sanguinary prince, being seized with a fever, the consequence of extreme grief for the loss of his most beloved son, Tushi Khan, expired on his march into the latter country, towards the close of A. H. 623, or A.D. 1226, in the seventy-third year of his age, and the twenty-fifth of his reign. He who without pity had slaughtered above two millions of the human race, had made so many children fatherless, and so many fathers childless, yet could not bear the loss of one son, though three remained to cherish his declining age:—astonishing proof of exquisite sensibility and the most callous ferocity dwelling in the same bosom." Monthly Review, p. 167, for June, 1804.

Printed by W Bulmer and Co.
Cleveland-Row, St. James's.

POSTSCRIPT.

The SUBSCRIBERS to the MODERN HISTORY of HINDOSTAN are respectfully informed that Part I. of the Second Volume, bringing that history down to the close of the reign of JEHANGUIRE, in A. D. 1627, is now published, and may be had at Mr. White's, Fleet-street. The great variety of interesting matter of which the final portion of the work will consist, must necessarily, delay its appearance till late in the *ensuing winter*.

Shortly will be published,

A NEW TRAGEDY,

Founded on NADIR SHAH'S INVASION of INDIA,

ENTITLED,

THE FALL OF THE MOGUL;

Attempted after the Greek model; and in which an effort is made to restore to that species of Dramatic Composition, the dignity of style, sentiment, and character, in which, of late years, it has been so lamentably deficient. In consequence of the heavy accumulation of expence occasioned by the historical undertaking, the author declines printing the Tragedy in question upon his own account; *but the publication of it being loudly demanded by the partiality of his friends, he begs to inform them that a book is opened at Mr. White's, Fleet-street, for receiving subscriptions, at* SEVEN SHILLINGS *the copy; and that it will be sent to press the instant a sufficient number of names shall appear to sanction the measure.*

DRAMATIS PERSONÆ.

NADIR SHAH, *Sovereign of Persia, Conqueror of Hindostan.*

MAHOMMED SHAH, *the Mogul Emperor, first dethroned, and then restored by* Nadir Shah.

SULTAN HAMED, *son of the Mogul, betrothed to* Solima.

NIZAM-AL-MULUCK, *the Mogul General.* } *Conspirators.*

SADIT KHAN, *an Indian Chief.* } *Conspirators.*

TAHMAS KHAN, *the Persian General.*

ZUMANI, *Empress of Hindostan.*

SOLIMA, *grand-daughter of Aurengzebe, betrothed to* Hamed.

CHORUS *of* BRAHMIN *priests.*

CHORUS *of* PERSEES, *fire-worshipers.*

Persian and Mogul Officers, Guards, Attendants.